Read Pattillo Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/1/2017

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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

Read Pattillo Elementary School

400 6TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
Thompson, Danielle	School Counselor	The school counselor provides for the social-emotional competencies of all students through the counseling programs and 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.
Butler, Tarell	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.
Crandall, Cindy	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.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Casalara-Ortiz, Carla	Teacher, ESE	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Kelly Lewis

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.*
21

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.*
16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
37

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (48%)

	2016-17: B (58%)
	2015-16: C (53%)
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	63	68	62	73	73	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	417
Attendance below 90 percent	12	12	7	12	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	5	2	4	9	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	2	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	2	4	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	8	6	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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**	
	(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	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%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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					
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					

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
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	
Students With Disabilities	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
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%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
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	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
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	52
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.

Science and ELA Learning Gains. Contributing factors to low performance includes the shifting changes in curriculum maps and resource alignment and effective use of PLCs and using data to drive instruction.

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

Science. Contributing factors to this decline includes the shifting changes in curriculum maps and resource alignment and effective use of PLCs and using data to drive instruction.

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.

Math. Contributing factors to this gap includes the shifting changes in curriculum maps and resource alignment and effective use of PLCs and using data to drive instruction.

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

ELA Learning gains of the lowest 25% and Math Learning Gains. For math, we used iXL to remediate math skills based on assessment data. For ELA, we used assessment data to remediate students skills.

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

We've identified Attendance as an area of concern.

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

1. Math
2. Attendance
3. Science
4. ELA
5. (ESE and Hispanic)ESSA sub groups

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practices will include following the curriculum map to align resources/ assessments to the standards and using data to make instructional decisions. Math was identified after looking at our school data and determining we had the greatest gap from the state average in math. Our school percent of students meeting achievement was 57% and the state was 63%, 6% below the state.
Measurable Outcome:	The summative math assessment data will increase in the percentage of students scoring at proficiency, as well as, providing remediation for those students not meeting proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cindy Smith (clsmith@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During weekly PLC's teachers, administration and academic coach will: Review upcoming standards, Align instructional activities with standards, Review common assessment data, and Develop instructional activities to remediate deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven instruction meets the needs of students. PLCs empower the faculty and administration to work collectively to provide quality instruction and improve student learning. Nationwide, the impact of the PLC model on teaching and learning has been impressive. Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) data showed a 24.1 percent gain in advanced and proficient scores for communication arts between 2001 and 2005.

Action Steps to Implement

Review the data and develop subgroups of students who need remediation
iReady (September and May)
Topic Check 1-15 (according to assessment Calendar)
SMT 5th grade January
FSA- May review (August)

Person Responsible	Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

During PLC, align resources and instructional practices to meet the needs of those students
Training: Math Curriculum Journey Including ESE Support-Self-Paced Canvas Course-Math Department

Person Responsible	Cindy Smith (clsmith@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Grade level and intervention teachers will implement instructional practices to remediate and reassess students to measure growth and review data at next PLC.
School City Training- Self Paced Canvas Course
School City Training- DLTL (Academic Coach)
Remediation Resources and Strategies Training/Support Math Department

Person Responsible	Corey McCormack (cmmccorm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitored tiered students and see if more support is needed. Move needed students through PST process to make sure tiered support is in place.

School City Training- DLTL (Academic Coach)
Remediation Resources and Strategies Training/Support Math Department

Person Responsible   Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practices will include vertical planning of the spiraled curriculum. Science was identified after looking at our school data and determining we had the greatest drop from the previous year in science. 63% of 5th grade students met achievement in 2018 and 50% met achievement in 2019, 13% decline.
Measurable Outcome:	The summative science assessment data will increase in the percentage of students scoring at proficiency, as well as, providing remediation for those students not meeting proficiency. 65% of 5th grade students will score at or above proficiency on FSA in Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cindy Smith (clsmith@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring the spiraling curriculum to identify areas of deficiency. PLC meeting minutes will reflect the data chats and targeted instructional practices. During weekly PLC's teachers, administration and academic coach will: Review upcoming standards, Align instructional activities with standards, Review common assessment data, and Develop instructional activities to remediate deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A spiraling curriculum requires vertical planning and data driven instruction will meet the needs of students. Data driven instruction meets the needs of students. PLCs empower the faculty and administration to work collectively to provide quality instruction and improve student learning. Nationwide, the impact of the PLC model on teaching and learning has been impressive. Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) data showed a 24.1 percent gain in advanced and proficient scores for communication arts between 2001 and 2005.

Action Steps to Implement

Review data to identify weakest standards that need to show growth.
K-1 Common Assessments 2nd and 4th quarter
2nd Topic Checks 1-6
3rd Topic Checks 1-5; VST 1-4
4th Topic Check 1-6: VST 1-4; SMT 2
5th Topic Check 1-4, 5,7,9; VST 1-3; SMT 1-2

Person Responsible	Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Look at the spiraling curriculum maps to identify activities and experiments at each grade level to support growth in specific standards.

Exploring Your Science Curriculum Self-Paced Canvas Course-District Science Department

Person Responsible	Cindy Smith (clsmith@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create a schedule for when activities and experiments will be implemented and share out with teachers
Academic Coach will lead through PLC's

Person Responsible Corey McCormack (cmmccorm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Each quarter, during a PLC meeting, teachers will provide copies of samples of the standards based activities done during that unit to support standards instruction. All teachers will be provided with a copy to keep in a binder provided by administration.

Person Responsible Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practices will include following the curriculum map to align resources/ assessments to the standards and using data to make instructional decisions. Math and ELA were identified as areas of focus for our ESSA subgroups (Hispanic 34.5% and Students with Disabilities 40%) after looking at our school data and determining these subgroups did not meet 41% overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	The summative math and ELA assessment data will increase in the percentage of students scoring at proficiency, as well as, providing remediation for those students not meeting proficiency. The average overall proficiency for students will increase to 41%of students meeting proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cindy Smith (clsmith@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring standards based data during PLC and incorporating instructional practices to meet areas of deficiency. PLC meeting minutes will reflect the data chats and targeted instructional practices.During weekly PLC's teachers, administration and academic coach will: Review upcoming standards, Align instructional activities with standards, Review common assessment data, and Develop instructional activities to remediate deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven instruction meets the needs of students. PLC's empower the faculty and administration to work collectively to provide quality instruction and improve student learning. Nationwide, the impact of the PLC model on teaching and learning has been impressive. Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) data showed a 24.1 percent gain in advanced and proficient scores for communication arts between 2001 and 2005.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students who are in our ESSA subgroups.

Person Responsible Corey McCormack (cmmccorm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

During PLC, align resources and instructional practices to meet the needs of those students
Math Curriculum Journey Training Including ESE Support- District Math Department
ELA Curriculum Canvas Self-Course- District ELA Department

Person Responsible Cindy Smith (clsmith@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Grade level and intervention teachers will implement instructional practices to remediate and reassess students to measure growth and review data at next PLC.
Support provided by district math and ELA contact

Person Responsible Cindy Smith (clsmith@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor ESSA subgroup students and see if more support is needed. Ensure that the level of supports is appropriate and being met. We will use the iReady ELA and Math assessments to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible	Kelly Lewis (krlewis@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.

Our area of focus for schoolwide improvement is attendance and tardies. Our school leadership team will identify classes with perfect attendance daily and make a school announcement. Each class with perfect attendance will earn a puzzle piece to display outside their door. Once the puzzle is built, the class earns a prize. If a class builds the puzzle 4 times, they earn a larger class prize. This will continue for every 4 times a class builds their puzzle. At the end of the year, the class with the most perfect attendance days, will earn a class party. In addition, individual students will be rewarded with CRIMP cash for being ready for learning on time each day. Students who are chronically absent will brought up through the PST process. Read-Pattillo has daily SEL time built into the Master Schedule. We are a PBIS school and we use the CRIMP reward system. Students will be trained through guided lessons to model Citizenship Respect Inclusiveness and Persistence. They will earn incentive dollars when modelling these attributes. They will shop in the school store every week during the first month of school and every other week there after. The PBIS committee trains the faculty annually and meets quarterly to give update data. As campus issues arise, the committee will meet to brainstorm solutions. Parents will receive information about the CRIMP program in the welcome folder. SEL is also part of the Parent Night training sessions. Our guidance counselor will support students through regular lessons as well as small group and individual guidance sessions. With improved Social Emotional Learning, the hope is that students will be more engaged in school and will attend regularly and on-time.

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.

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 positive culture and environment of our school for our students in identified ESSA subgroups is to continue our mentoring program and implementation of our H.U.G. strategy (Hello. Update. Goal) to help create a positive learning environment for our students.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00