Robert M. Paterson Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Robert M. Paterson Elementary

5400 PINE AVE, Orange Park, FL 32003

http://pes.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: John O'brian

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Clay 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

Robert M. Paterson Elementary

5400 PINE AVE, Orange Park, FL 32003

http://pes.oneclay.net

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-6	No	27%

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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

R.M. Paterson Elementary seeks to create a learning environment where faculty encourages high expectations and collaboratively works together to implement the Florida State Standards that will provide a quality education to all students. Our school promotes a safe, nurturing, and supportive environment that fosters high self esteem and encourages and motivates students to do their personal best. Furthermore, we strive to have parents, teachers, and community members to be actively involved in our student's learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

For teachers to continue to improve their knowledge and perfect their teaching skills through resources, workshops, and training opportunities provided by the school and district. For teachers to enhance their understanding of the new curriculum while implementing these best teaching practices in the classroom, directly impacting students to better prepare them for their continuous academic growth, college and careers in the future.

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
O'Brian, John	Principal	Overseeing the daily function of the school.
Schumacher, Courtney	Assistant Principal	Assisting the Principal in the overseeing and implementing the daily functions of the school.
Stokes, Lori	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in the everyday facilitation of the school.
Bartel, Jody	Teacher, K-12	KG Team Leader
Parish, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Leader
Sad, Mandy	School Counselor	Head of Guidance
Pierson, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Team Leader
Hollinger, Lorraine	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Team Leader
Bonham, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	ESE Team Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/20/2021, John O'brian

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.*
12

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
84

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,105

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

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	135	161	149	162	161	150	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	1084
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	3	8	8	11	22	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	1	3	3	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/20/2021

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	145	134	161	153	129	149	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	1021
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	4	7	8	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	1	2	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	4	7	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	145	134	161	153	129	149	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	1021
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	4	7	8	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	1	2	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	4	7	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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				79%	65%	57%	77%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	62%	58%	69%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	54%	53%	58%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				80%	70%	63%	79%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				77%	66%	62%	75%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	56%	51%	57%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				72%	65%	53%	70%	66%	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	78%	68%	10%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	64%	15%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	62%	17%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2021					
	2019	74%	64%	10%	54%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	79%	71%	8%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	69%	12%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	64%	9%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2021					
	2019	78%	70%	8%	55%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	71%	63%	8%	53%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready reading and mathematics scores.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	39	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	15	30
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	60	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	4	33	58
	English Language Learners	0	50	50

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	59	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	7	29	53
	English Language Learners	0	17	11
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	52	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	4	23	47
	English Language Learners	0	17	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	68	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	10	42	58
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	39	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	7	23	55
	English Language Learners	0	0	33

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55	77	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	13	45	69
	English Language Learners	0	22	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	59	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	36	56
	English Language Learners	0	22	56

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	56	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	7	20	32
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24	53	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	7	27	35
	English Language Learners	0	20	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	18%	79%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	7	20	33
	English Language Learners	0	20	40

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	64	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	13	23	24
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	55	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	29	29
	Students With Disabilities	13	17	43
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	49	54	47	51	35	21	46				
ELL	41	40		45	73						
ASN	92			92							
BLK	52	50	38	56	42		50				
HSP	60	54	31	57	55	47	74				
MUL	68			79							
WHT	82	69	54	83	63	32	85				
FRL	58	55	41	60	52	32	61				
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	51	61	54	48	57	50	36				
ELL	61	63	50	70	67	50					
ASN	100			100							
BLK	53	63	40	53	57	62	9				
HSP	66	63	52	67	61	40	65				
MUL	65	58		76	83						
WHT	85	73	71	86	84	68	82				
FRL	65	66	57	66	67	46	55				

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	50	56	52	51	54	42	38				
ELL	50	60		56	82	80					
ASN	100	82		100	100						
BLK	65	57	50	49	61	47	45				
HSP	61	64	48	67	68	52	47				
MUL	87	92		87	75						
WHT	80	69	60	84	77	60	76				
FRL	67	63	46	68	74	54	62				

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
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	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	55
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	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	67
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	53
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?

Evaluating the data, each grade level showed either a gain or maintained their previous years proficiency.

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

Increasing the lower quartile gains in both areas of language arts and mathematics.

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

Facilitating the new curriculum with fidelity and increasing grade level content exposed to various groups of students.

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

ELA

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

The hiring of new staff and more structured PLCs.

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

Consistency in the educational environment and integration of the new ELA curriculum. More structured and focused PLCs.

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.

More streamlined and structured PLCs among common content teachers, same grade level, vertical PLCs, Curriculum coaches, District supports and professional development.

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

Consistency in grade level content collaboration and PLCs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We continuously monitored our i-Ready math scores as an indicator. After receiving the FSA results we certainly needed to improve our overall math proficiency and math gains. Under the perils of Covid, we dropped in all but one grade level. With this analysis, we are taking measures to ensure that we address our concerns in the area of overall proficiency and growth in mathematics.
Measurable Outcome:	If all the teachers implement differentiated, small group instruction through the integration of the Eureka Math and Go Math curriculum, THEN, PES should see learning proficiency reach 79% and mathematical gains increase to 69% in mathematics.
Monitoring:	I- Ready data, PLCs, small group data, formal and informal observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of rigorous and grade level content with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Exposing ALL students to grade level and rigorous content will result is students' growth through exposure and building on previous foundation skills. Eureka and Go Math instructional materials, i-Ready data, teacher data, formal and informal assessments, walkthoughts and formal observations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Exposure to the Eureka math curriculum and resources.
1. Exposure to the Eureka and Go Math curriculum and resources.
2. Professional Development with guest speakers modeling lessons.
3. District Training and Coaches' support.
4 PLCs (grade level content and vertical format)

Person Responsible	John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Evaluating the PES Climate Survey and data, we identified one of the lowest areas based on students' responses.
Measurable Outcome:	To improve student positive peer relations with individuals. This objective was based on the climate survey result data. After implementing strategies, we will see an increase in students' perspective based on the 2022 climate survey results.
Monitoring:	PBIS teams, Attendance team, "7 Mindsets", Character Education and Guidance lessons. Having quarterly meetings to evaluate data and identify students that are at risk based on referrals and teacher recommendations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mandy Sad (mandy.sad@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To expose students to what is and how to achieve positive peer relations with individuals. We want to ensure how students enhance their personal growth and understand peer relationships and the role they play in children's lives and relationships with peers become even more influential as children enter adolescence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To enhance the Social/Emotional Learning of students at Paterson and foster their potential to understand and apply this knowledge to improve Positive Peer Relations. , attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. There will be pre and post test given to students regarding their understanding of peer relationships.
2. . PBIS, Attendance, Discipline, and Academic data meetings.
2. Character Trait Lunches
3. Professional Development
4. MTSS Behavior
5. 7 Mindsets and Character Education curriculum
5. Small Group Counseling targeting peer groups

Person Responsible	Mandy Sad (mandy.sad@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After evaluating the 2021 FSA data, we decreased in all areas of learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	If all teachers implement differentiated, small group instruction with research based interventions, then PES should see learning gains increase at least ten percent in reading and math.
Monitoring:	I- Ready data, PLCs, small group data, formal and informal observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers analyze data to determine areas of weakness and refers to the standards-aligned learning target when checking for understanding. Teachers will utilize this data to intentionally create groups of students based on their assessment results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of small group instruction, evaluation of progress and monitoring data, and effective strategies to enhance student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Integrating small group instructions within the classroom with fidelity.
2. Professional Development with guest speakers modeling lessons.
3. District Training and Coaches' support.
4 PLCs (grade level content and vertical format)

Person Responsible	John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)

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.

Paterson Elementary is a very structured and provides a very safe learning environment. Classroom and campus academic and behavior expectations are communicated to the staff, students and parents through articulations and providing access to the rules in a written format. This is an attempt to ensure all stakeholders are under the same understanding of violations, consequences, etc. One of the main focus for this school year will be peer interactions. This will be addressed through a positive and accountable environment and class lessons facilitated through our Guidance department. We will review the discipline data quarterly and addressed any specific students and/or areas of concern by providing interventions, communication to parents, District staff, etc., to ensure the student(s) are receiving the assistance they need to improve their academics and/or behavior.

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.

PES has a well developed plan for communicating with all stakeholders. School, activities, etc., information is continuously provided to parents and community through PES social media, phone calls, newsletters, weekly student folders and flyers. PES has several activities throughout the school year that promotes school and community participation.

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

PES has a very strong and active Parent Faculty Association, SAC committee, etc. Parents are often informed of information, invited and involved in decision making that may have an impact on all stakeholders.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00