

Volusia County Schools

# Pierson Elementary School



## 2020-21 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Pierson Elementary School

1 W 1ST AVE, Pierson, FL 32180

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kimberly Hutcherson J**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (48%)
<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>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Pierson Elementary School

1 W 1ST AVE, Pierson, FL 32180

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

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

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

All students engage in a superior 21st century education.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

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

## Demographic Information



**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Kimberly Hutcherson J

**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.*

40

**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**

45

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (48%)
<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>	N/A

<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	69	72	72	75	75	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	56%	57%	36%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	56%	58%	36%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	46%	53%	41%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	59%	63%	56%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	56%	62%	45%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	43%	51%	33%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	57%	53%	51%	59%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	50%	58%	-8%	58%	-8%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	54%	-22%	58%	-26%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
	2018	32%	51%	-19%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%

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

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

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	4	29	45	13	43	45	18				
ELL	33	44	63	57	61	54	32				
BLK	27			45							
HSP	35	43	63	59	61	54	32				
WHT	47	38	42	67	67	67	59				
FRL	35	40	55	58	61	58	36				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	8	30	33	18	22	27	14				
ELL	27	42	38	43	30	23	31				
BLK	9	20		36	50						
HSP	34	42	33	51	40	22	45				
WHT	57	52		64	49		76				
FRL	36	41	35	52	42	25	46				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	8	21	29	24	32	22	5				
ELL	24	24	35	50	40	35	23				
BLK	18			55							
HSP	33	33	36	54	44	37	45				
WHT	51	45		65	51		70				
FRL	33	35	42	53	42	33	46				

### ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	55
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	49
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.**

4.3% of the SWD at Pierson Elementary (Students with Disabilities) subgroup scored proficient in ELA on the last FSA (2019). Comparison to the overall district average of percent proficient at 18.1%, demonstrates a significant area of concern for SWD at Pierson Elementary. Many of the (SWD) students have a significant reading deficiency and receive program based instruction, such as Wilson Reading and Rewards, or Support Facilitation services. Although services are provided with fidelity, gains are not immediately or readily achieved.

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

Percentage of students scoring proficient on the Statewide Science Assessment was 41%, which indicates an 8% decrease in students scoring proficient in science from the prior year. Instructional time for the 18-19SY in science was reduced by fifteen minutes from the prior year. In addition, the cohort of students tested in science demonstrated a significant lack of reading proficiency, which may have impacted their science proficiency due to the reading component of the science assessment. Significant ELA learning gains were made for our ELL students in the 2019SY. However, many ELL students still demonstrate ELA proficiency needs.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

ELA overall proficiency is the most significant area of concern, demonstrated by the gap in proficiency when compared to averages for the district and state on the 2019FSA, as well as iReady Diagnostics in the 19-20SY. iReady Diagnostic 2 showed only 38% of students in Tier 1. Several factors may contribute to score disparity, such as the high percentage of FRL students, as well as language barriers our ELL students may experience. Vocabulary and background knowledge deficits are also challenges. With appropriate scaffolding and consistent intervention, 57% of the lowest quartile in ELA showed learning gains in the 2019SY.

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

Learning Gains(LG) in ELA and Math were the two most significant areas of improvement in the 2019SY, with 57% of the Lowest Quartile showing LG and 60% of the ELL subgroup showing 60% LG. Performance on district assessments in the 19-20SY remained consistent with this trend, when reviewing data for all grade levels. The subgroup of ELL students demonstrated the most improvement in ELA on the 2019 FSA, with . Students will continue to receive daily practice with on level text along with scaffolding and differentiated instruction. In addition, standards aligned instruction during small group activities will remain an essential part of the instructional plan.

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

Attendance and percentage of students scoring at proficiency level 1 continue to be the most significant areas of concern in regard to EWS. Very few students demonstrate a need for tier 3 intervention in behavior, which is demonstrated in the annual discipline/behavior data.

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



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

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	ELA proficiency on 2019 FSA was 39%. iReady Diagnostic 2 showed only 38% of students in Tier 1, with a significant percentage in Tier 2 and 15% at risk in Tier 3.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase overall ELA Proficiency from 39% to 70%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Standards aligned small group instruction.  Selected strategy demonstrates a positive impact on student achievement through higher student expectations and increased exposure to subject matter with focused instruction. Dr. Hattie's research and the Marzano Center for Collaborative Classroom support the following elements of standards aligned instruction:
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear learning targets/objectives and success criteria.</li> <li>2. Actively engage students with content, such as generating questions while reading, taking/organizing notes, summarizing, graphic organizers, anchor charts/concept maps and feedback.</li> <li>3. Multiple exposures and practice with standards/targeted skills.</li> <li>4. Practice with identified standard and appropriate feedback.</li> <li>5. Collaborative structures</li> </ol>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review 2019 FSA data for 5th grade students and school data (iReady and Wonders) for all other grades to support data driven instructional groups.
2. Provide support through academic coaching and professional learning opportunities regarding standards based instruction to increase instructional capacity.
3. Communicate and monitor small group essentials, such as curriculum resources per provider (Classroom Teacher, ESE Teachers, ESOL Teachers, Intervention Teacher).
4. Ongoing Progress Monitoring (walk-through data, review of student data in PLC) will be used to identify needs, adjust instructional pacing/grouping and evaluate student achievement/progress on SIP focus area. In addition, individual students will maintain Student Data Binders to track their growth, with opportunities for Student Led Conferencing with Teachers, SLT members and Parents.

**Person Responsible** Catherine Deane (cdeane@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Increased proficiency in writing is anticipated to have a positive impact on the overall ELA proficiency. The 2019 FSA data revealed that only 9% of students in 4th and 5th grades earned a 70% or higher in the reporting category Text Based Writing. While this is a school-wide concern, it also will also positively impact ESSA subgroups.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	75% of 4th and 5th grade students taking FSA will achieve 70% or higher in the Text Based Writing reporting category.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Standards aligned instruction.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Selected strategy demonstrates a positive impact on student achievement through higher student expectations and increased exposure to subject matter with focused instruction. Dr. Hattie's research and the Marzano Center for Collaborative Classroom support the following elements of standards aligned instruction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear learning targets / objectives and success criteria.</li> <li>2. Actively engage students with content, such as generating questions while reading, taking/organizing notes, summarizing, graphic organizers, anchor charts/concept maps and feedback.</li> <li>3. Multiple exposure / standards aligned.</li> <li>4. Practice with identified standard and appropriate feedback.</li> <li>5. Collaborative structures.</li> </ol>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Students will engage in daily writing instruction and practice.
2. Students will be provided with feedback to improve writing skills.
3. Usage of text based evidence will be embedded in daily practice during the ELA block.
4. Training for all (ELA) teachers in Core Connections writing instruction.
5. Implementation of Core Connections writing instruction school-wide.

**Person Responsible** Catherine Deane (cdeane@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus** 41% of Students were proficient in Science on the 2019 Statewide Science Assessment.

**Description and Rationale:** 2019-2020SY SMT data shows an average score of 58% and only 25% of students achieving proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase Science Proficiency from 41% to 70%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Catherine Deane (cdeane@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards based Instruction using formative assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Dr. Hattie's Research: Per Hattie (2012) "formative evaluation refers to any activity used as an assessment of learning progress before or during the learning process itself. In contrast with formative assessment, the summative assessment evaluates what students know or have learned at the end of the teaching, after all is done." Formative assessment answers the key questions: Where is the learner going? Where is the learner now? How will the learner get to where he/she needs to be? Two main purposes of questioning: To promote student thinking and elicit evidence of student learning, surface errors and misconceptions.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Standards Based Instruction with clear learning targets and success criteria.
2. Fair Game Instructional Pacing/ Plan developed during PLC to ensure weekly review of prior grade level standards students will encounter on 5th grade science assessment.
3. Item Analysis will be conducted on formative and summative assessments to guide instruction and provide remediation on identified standards.
4. Purchase Page Keeley science probes for hands-on science classroom labs and investigations to support mastery of standards.
5. Provide professional learning to grade level teams during PLC to ensure all teachers can successfully implement the Page Keeley science probes. The Academic Coach will provide support through coaching cycles and collaborative planning. Impact of professional learning will be monitored through classroom visits, PLC and data analysis of assessment results.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Hutcherson (khutche@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.

**Attendance continues to be an area of concern. Frequent contact, along with academic support and information, will be made to improve attendance for identified students. The School Social Worker, Parent Liaison and administration will monitor and provide contact. In addition, a school-wide attendance initiative with individual "brag tag" incentives and class/grade incentives based on weekly perfect attendance or overall attendance percentages will be implemented.**

## 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.

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

### 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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00