Pride Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pride Elementary School

1100 LEARNING LN, Deltona, FL 32738

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

Demographics

Principal: Eilene Ahr C

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	
* 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.](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

Pride Elementary School

1100 LEARNING LN, Deltona, FL 32738

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, Elizabeth	Principal	
Sylvester, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Ebert, Emma	Instructional Coach	
Roberts, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Kyle	Teacher, ESE	
Harvey, Timberlay	Instructional Media	
Madison, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	
Swindle, Amber	Teacher, K-12	
Hatch, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Fowler, Tiffany	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/9/2018, Eilene Ahr C

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
46

Total number of students enrolled at the school
556

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	83	87	75	86	106	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	9	12	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
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	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	2	1	4	1	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	1	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 8/9/2021

2020-21 - 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	61	57	64	80	64	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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

2020-21 - 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	61	57	64	80	64	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				49%	56%	57%	52%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	58%	48%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	46%	53%	26%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	59%	63%	57%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	56%	62%	52%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	43%	51%	38%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	57%	53%	54%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	51%	58%	-7%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	56%	-12%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady diagnostics and progress monitoring, curriculum topic checks, FLKRS, FSA , SMT, Teacher created formatives and summatives

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65/27.69%	68/42.65%	70/57.14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/25.00%	57/40.35%	57/52.63%
	Students With Disabilities	7/0.00%	7/28.57%	9/33.33%
	English Language Learners	5/20.00%	6/16.67%	8/12.50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	62/16.13%	53/45.28%	69/52.17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/15.09%	43/41.86%	56/50.00%
	Students With Disabilities	7/0.0%	5/0.0%	9/22.22%
	English Language Learners	5/0.0%	2/50.00%	7/42.86%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77/32.47%	78/43.59%	77/53.25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/21.88%	63/33.33%	62/45.16%
	Students With Disabilities	13/0.0%	12/16.67%	13/30.77%
	English Language Learners	4/0.00%	6/0.00%	5/20.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71/12.68%	77/27.27%	76/39.47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/8.62%	62/19.35%	61/36.07%
	Students With Disabilities	12/0.00%	12/0.00%	12/8.33%
	English Language Learners	4/0.00%	5/0.00%	5/0.00%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	96/39.58%	100/61.00%	97/72.16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	82/40.24%	85/60.00%	83/68.67%
	Students With Disabilities	20/15.00%	19/26.32%	18/38.89%
	English Language Learners	17/29.41%	16/50.00%	17/58.82%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	92/11.96%	93/26.88%	96/52.08%
	Economically Disadvantaged	78/11.54%	79/24.05%	82/50.00%
	Students With Disabilities	18/11.11%	19/21.05%	18/22.22%
	English Language Learners	16/18.75%	15/20.00%	18/38.89%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76/30.26%	93/39.78%	102/47.06%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/28.57%	72/38.89%	77/37.66%
	Students With Disabilities	19/10.53%	23/13.04%	24/16.67%
	English Language Learners	7/0.00%	10/10.00%	13/0.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71/12.68%	86/29.07%	86/59.30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/11.54%	66/28.79%	64/54.69%
	Students With Disabilities	16/12.5-%	22/13.64%	22/31.82%
	English Language Learners	6/0.00%	9/0.00%	8/12.50%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	79/25.00%	87/40.91%	87/37.93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/24.64%	73/41.10%	72/36.11%
	Students With Disabilities	21/4.76%	23/8.70%	23/17.39%
	English Language Learners	15/18.75%	19/21.055	19/21.05%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78/14.10%	85/30.59%	86/46.51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/11.94%	72/31.94%	71/45.07%
	Students With Disabilities	20/0.00%	23/4.35%	22/13.64%
	English Language Learners	16/0.00%	19/15.79%	17/35.29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	323/50%	309/78%	176/80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	280/47.00%	264/80%	145/79%
	Students With Disabilities	82/41.00%	79/68%	46/61%
	English Language Learners	66/21%	69/63%	36/63%

Subgroup Data Review

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	25	41	36	28	40		31				
ELL	32	58		32	45		33				
BLK	52	50		48			40				
HSP	53	54		49	58		38				
WHT	53	70		53	50		70				
FRL	50	59	58	48	57	50	46				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	20	41	40	15	22	8	20				
ELL	27	33	31	41	42	17	25				
BLK	42	60		42	50		27				
HSP	43	45	37	53	47	25	37				
MUL	46			36							
WHT	58	61	54	63	49	20	61				
FRL	46	52	47	52	46	25	43				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	13	21	19	18	26	22	15				
ELL	38	36	30	38	41						
BLK	46	44		42	25						
HSP	49	39	25	56	54	47	43				
MUL	42			42							
WHT	56	57	25	63	58	40	65				
FRL	50	46	28	54	50	36	51				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Math is a greater deficiency school-wide than ELA, ESSR subgroups of ELL and ESE students are underperforming in all curriculum areas

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the progress monitoring and 2019 FSA the greatest needs are math achievement, lowest quartile, and science achievement based on the NGSS state test 2019.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors for this need were lack of small group instruction, lack of differentiation, need to teach standards based lessons, need to enforce inclusive scheduling. New actions that would need to be taken to address this need for improvement are implementation of district adopted curriculum and accommodations, implementing walk to intervention, and ensuring validity of instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments ESE student performance showed the most improvement although still underperforming compared to other subgroups.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors for this improvement were staffing changes, fidelity of program implementation, progress monitoring of ESE student performance. One of the actions taken were flexible scheduling with district support and district curriculum expert support in all areas.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate learning we will implement standards based lessons, small group instruction, differentiation, push-in for ELL and ESE teachers, and require district curriculum to be used with fidelity. District resource teachers will work with new staff at Pride to ensure curriculum is taught effectively.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will be supported through professional development in the following areas:
*Teacher clarity
*Small group
*Differentiation
* Walk to intervention
* ELL and ESE accommodations
* Depth of standards
*Building Capacity in ESE staff through professional development in all programs

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services that will be implemented are cross training all ESE staff in all programs, professional development on teacher clarity, student data chats, walk to intervention, and utilizing iReady reports to develop targeted math lessons for intervention.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ESSA group of students with disabilities overall proficiency rate was at 27% and ELL students overall proficiency rate was at 33%.
Measurable Outcome:	Pride Elementary' s ESSA group of students with learning disabilities will increase overall proficiency from 27% to 35% on FSA. ELL students overall proficiency will increase from 33% to 40%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom observations, inclusive scheduling, ESE teacher trainings on curriculum and ESE programs, monthly student data chats, and monthly PLC review of accommodations. We will also monitor through, coaching cycles based on teacher needs through walkthroughs and visitations by district staff and coach and student performance on data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence based strategy is small group instruction. We will monitor it through walkthroughs by school administrators/coach and district support team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. This along with standards-based instruction/planning will create a solid response to intervention which has a 1.07 effect size based on Hattie's research. Small group differentiation will: * Provide all students with the opportunity to explore and apply key concepts * Provide a frequent way to monitor a student's path to success in learning intentions * Flexible grouping of students that will make it possible for students to work together to provide opportunities for differences and commonality *Encourage students in an active manner to explore and reach the success targets

Action Steps to Implement

Inclusive scheduling held prior to master schedule completion to ensure that Support Facilitation, Intervention teachers and Self-contained services are met.

Person Responsible	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

An ELA walk-to-intervention program will take place daily for all students based on data collected.

Person Responsible	Emma Ebert (elebert@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Daily math intervention to close achievement gaps will be provided to all students.

Person Responsible	Emma Ebert (elebert@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus aligns to strategic plan goal 1: engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 FSA data, it revealed that our ELA overall proficiency was at 49% which is a decrease from 52% the 2018. Our SLT decided to focus on a walk to intervention where students will receive differentiation based on their needs.
Measurable Outcome:	Pride Elementary' s overall ELA proficiency achievement level will increase from 49% to 60%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using visitation and walkthrough tools with specific ELA look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is differentiation. We will monitor it through frequent classroom observations/visitations, incorporating inclusive scheduling, ESE teacher trainings on curriculum and ESE programs, monthly student data chats, and monthly PLC review of accommodations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation and scaffolding allow students multiple opportunities to attain the success criteria of the lesson. Scaffolding has a .82 effect size according to John Hattie. John Hattie describes differentiation and scaffolding as ways to: *Facilitate student performance via feedback *Keep students motivated via the prevention of minimization of frustration

Action Steps to Implement

Creation of a school wide daily WTI program focusing on ELA.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional development for teachers providing WTI instruction by the third week of school.

Person Responsible	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Content area experts at district level will assist staff with planning, placing, and curriculum implementation.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 FSA data, it revealed that our overall proficiency for ELA was at 49%. Our SLT decided to focus on depth of knowledge of curriculum standards for ELA instruction to improve overall gains to 60%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA overall proficiency from 49% to 60% proficiency. Increase ELA LQ gains from 45% to 55%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through implementation of success criteria to learning targets, frequent classroom observations/visitations, monitoring of inclusive scheduling, ESE teacher data reviews, quarterly student data chats, collaborative planning time provided through PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence based strategy is instructional practice focusing on professional development on teacher clarity and the implementation of success criteria. We will monitor it through professional development exit slips, lesson plan development, collaborative planning time, and frequent walkthroughs/visitations, by school-based administrators, coach, and district support team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional practice focusing on professional development through teacher clarity has a .84 effect size. John Hattie describes effective teachers as those who: * Believe that all students can reach the success criteria * Influence surface and deep student performance *Monitor learning and provide feedback

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development provided to all teachers on Teacher Clarity beginning on September 28, 2021/ Continuing through through the duration of the school year.

Person Responsible	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor the implementation of success criteria within standards focus boards beginning October 4, 2021 and continuing through the duration of the school year.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Participate in school wide learning walks to include, curriculum specialist, curriculum resource teachers, district administration and school leadership team bi-monthly .

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 FSA data, it revealed that our overall proficiency for math was at 55%. Our SLT decided to focus on depth of knowledge of curriculum standards for math instruction to improve overall gains to 60%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase math overall proficiency from 55% to 60% proficiency. Increase math LQ gains from 29% to 39%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations/visitations, monitoring of inclusive scheduling, ESE teacher data reviews, monthly student data chats, and monthly PLC review of data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is instructional practice focusing on depth of knowledge through effective teaching strategies. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs/ visitations, by school-based administrators, coach, and district support team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional practice focusing on depth of knowledge through effective teaching strategies has a .62 effect size. This along with standards-based instruction/planning will create a solid response to intervention which has a 1.07 effect size based on Hattie's research. John Hattie describes effective teachers as those who: * Believe that all students can reach the success criteria * Influence surface and deep student performance * Monitor learning and provide feedback

Action Steps to Implement

Provide a school wide daily math intervention time.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Bi-monthly walk-throughs will be provided by district curriculum resource teacher, administration and leadership team members.

Person Responsible	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional development will be provided to teachers on Reflex Math to improve math intervention instruction.

Person Responsible	Emma Ebert (elebert@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Pride has a higher number of Threats compared to other school sites. SEL weekly messages for entire school, discipline data will be reviewed monthly in PLC.

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.

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

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

SAC chair is responsible for developing handouts that address the required documents for all SAC activities and PTO. The SAC chairperson will also focus meetings on academic events and district related information. Family liaison is responsible for developing and disseminating schoolwide information such as open house, parent events, and community events. The family liaison also will create a monthly newsletter that all parents will receive regarding schoolwide events and information. The guidance counselor is responsible for holding student service meetings, providing a weekly positive message for students, and helping parents with community resources.
Monthly faculty meetings held by administration which will review academics, behavior, district requirements and positive teacher parent relationships. Principal holds multiple events throughout the year for positive family engagement as well as monitoring and organizing a student mentoring program (Love our Lions).

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00