

Volusia County Schools

Read Pattillo Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Read Pattillo Elementary School

400 6TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Read Pattillo Elementary School

400 6TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Read-Pattillo family and community are committed to creating an environment where every student will dream, reach, achieve, soar.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lewis, Kelly	Principal	The principal is responsible for the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The principal establishes an orderly, safe, and secure environment.
McCormack, Corey	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal establishes an orderly, safe, and secure environment.
Schrader, Jen	Instructional Coach	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Casalara-Ortiz, Carla	Teacher, ESE	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic and social-emotional concern.
Crandall, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Thompson, Danielle	School Counselor	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic and social-emotional concern.
Grube, Korey	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Kelly Lewis

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

363

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	55	45	50	66	63	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	345
Attendance below 90 percent	13	10	13	14	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	3	10	8	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	5	0	5	10	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	53	42	55	66	57	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335
Attendance below 90 percent	3	5	13	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	53	42	55	66	57	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335
Attendance below 90 percent	3	5	13	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	53%	56%				54%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						52%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						53%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	59%	42%	50%				57%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						69%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						55%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	55%	59%				50%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	59%	8%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	33	23	13	36	58	38	25				
BLK	22	39	33	17	63	53	27				
HSP	64			55							
MUL	45			60							
WHT	66	57		67	74	40	77				
FRL	54	53	29	57	68	43	60				
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	23	42		26	50		42				
BLK	23			19							
HSP	60			30							
MUL	42			45							
WHT	59	59		62	65		70				
FRL	48	51	25	51	63	50	51				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	36	47	25	61	53					
BLK	29	38		38	59	43	38				
HSP	23			46							
MUL	64			57							
WHT	63	56	64	63	74	69	60				
FRL	46	53	58	50	68	52	34				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	60
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	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

After reviewing the data from the previous year to the 2021-2022 FSA scores, our 3rd Grade Achievement scores in ELA dropped 5 points from 64% to 59% of our students scoring a level 3 or higher, while in math we increased 20 points from 46% to 66% of students scoring a level 3 or higher. Our 4th Grade Achievement scores in ELA increased 9 points from 48% to 57% of our students scoring a level 3 or higher and in math we increased 16 points from 45% to 61% of students scoring a level 3 or higher. Our 5th Grade Achievement scores in ELA decreased 1 point from 54% to 53% of our students scoring a level 3 or higher and in math we decreased 16 points from a 61% to 45% of students scoring a level 3 or higher. In science we increased 7 points from 58% to 65% of our fifth grade students scoring a level 3 or higher.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The areas that have the greatest need for improvement are ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains (32%), Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains (48%), and our ESSA Subgroups: SWD (32% overall students scoring a level 3 or higher) and Black/African American Students (36% overall students scoring a level 3 or higher).

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement would be lack of implementing small group and tired instruction properly. As well as a lack of implementing new curriculum and standards with fidelity while also not fully understanding the clarifications of the benchmarks.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement are the Math Learning Gains with an increase of 13 points to 72% overall students scoring a level 3 or higher and Science Achievement scores with an increase of 7 points to 65% of our 5th graders scoring a level 3 or higher.

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

Contributing factors for this improvement was deliberate planning for both math and science to reach all students, but specifically our Lowest Quartile students. Vertically planning between teachers to address science standards missed due to COVID shutdown. Specific focus on tiered instruction in Math.

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

The strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are a focus on small group instruction, and an understanding of tiered instruction. Precise planning using BEST standards with a clear focus on clarifications and rigor of benchmarks.

We will also target our ESSA Subgroup students with our H.U.G. mentor initiative. Read-Pattillo's H.U.G. initiative is a mentoring program that targets students who have been identified as one of our two ESSA Subgroups (Students with Disabilities and Black/African American Students). Teachers sign up to be a H.U.G. Mentor and meet with their "H.U.G." student(s) for a Hello (H), Update (U), and Goal (G). In the beginning of the year, all the H.U.G. students receive a letter explaining what the H.U.G. program is, introducing their mentor teacher, and letting them know what day and time to meet with their mentor. We meet with the H.U.G. students to review what the program is overall and how to set goals. Mentor teachers are provided with various forms of data monitoring to help students set goals and reach them. As a school, we monitor our H.U.G. students (ESSA subgroup students) by tracking their progress on the FAST assessments and on the various district assessments.

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.

Professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders are: District MTSS ERPLs; Standards & Clarification Planning in PLCs; Small Group ERPL & Planning during PLCs; Mentor Training.

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 to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year are dedicated planning PLC time using benchmarks and clarifications and consistent monitoring of our Lowest Quartile and ESSA subgroups.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. 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 it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 58%, ELA Learning Gains were 54% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 32%. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two ESSA Subgroups; SWD (32%) and Black/African American students (36%).

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable**Outcome:****State the****specific****measurable**

outcome the school plans to achieve. Increase ELA Overall proficiency from 58% to 62%. Increase our ESSA subgroups overall proficiency in ELA from 36% to 54% for our Black/African American Students and from 32% to 54% for our Students with Disabilities.

This should**be a data****based,****objective****outcome.**

This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations with specific ELA look-fors, to include small group instruction and Response to Intervention (tiered instruction), and precise planning using BEST standards and clarifications during PLCs.

Monitoring:**Describe****how this****Area of****Focus will****be****monitored****for the****desired****outcome.**

Students in our ESSA subgroups will be in our H.U.G. mentor initiative. Students will meet with their mentor teacher weekly and do a hello, update, and set a goal. Goals will be set based on student data and monitored throughout the year.

Read-Pattillo's H.U.G. initiative is a mentoring program that targets students who have been identified as one of our students in one of our two ESSA Subgroups (Students with Disabilities and Black/African American Students). Teachers sign up to be a H.U.G. Mentor and meet with their "H.U.G." student(s) for a Hello (H), Update (U), and Goal (G). In the beginning of the year, all the H.U.G. students receive a letter explaining what the H.U.G. program is, introducing their mentor teacher, and letting them know what day and time to meet with their mentor. We meet with the H.U.G. students to review what the program is overall and how to set goals. Mentor teachers are provided with various forms of data monitoring to help students set goals and reach them. As a school, we monitor our H.U.G. students (ESSA subgroup students) by tracking their progress on the FAST assessments and on the various district assessments.

Person**responsible****for****monitoring****outcome:**

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our evidence based strategy is Response to Intervention. Based on research by John Hattie, planning for tiered instruction using RTI has a 1.29 efficacy rate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Response to Intervention (RTI) is a framework for implementing proactive data-driven decision making. It provides teacher with better, more timely information about students in order to improve student learning and performance. According to John Hattie, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29, while the average effect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Response to Intervention.

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

Provide ongoing professional learning in Response to Intervention during small group PLCs and a school-based ERPL.

Person Responsible Jen Schrader (jschrad@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data review with planning during PLCs for Tiered, Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible Jen Schrader (jschrad@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct classroom walkthroughs during Small Group Instruction, using a walkthrough protocol with specific ELA look-fors.

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

Quarterly SLT meetings to monitor instructional practices specifically related to ELA.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus
Description and**

Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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 only 32% of our lowest quartile made learning gains in ELA and 48% of our lowest quartile made learning gains in Math. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one our two ESSA Subgroups; SWD (32% meeting proficiency) and Black/African American students (36% meeting proficiency).

Measurable**Outcome:****State the specific measurable****outcome the**

school plans to achieve.

Our goal will be to increase our ESSA subgroups overall proficiency in ELA from 36% to 54% for our Black/African American Students and from 32% to 54% for our Students with Disabilities.

This should**be a data****based,****objective****outcome.**

This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations with specific ELA look-fors, to include small group instruction and Response to Intervention (tiered instruction), and precise planning using BEST standards and clarifications during PLCs. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.

Monitoring:**Describe****how this****Area of****Focus will****be****monitored****for the****desired****outcome.**

Students in our ESSA subgroups will be in our H.U.G. mentor initiative. Students will meet with their mentor teacher weekly and do a hello, update, and set a goal. Goals will be set based on student data and monitored throughout the year.

Read-Pattillo's H.U.G. initiative is a mentoring program that targets students who have been identified as one of our students in one of our two ESSA Subgroups (Students with Disabilities and Black/African American Students). Teachers sign up to be a H.U.G. Mentor and meet with their "H.U.G." student(s) for a Hello (H), Update (U), and Goal (G). In the beginning of the year, all the H.U.G. students receive a letter explaining what the H.U.G. program is, introducing their mentor teacher, and letting them know what day and time to meet with their mentor. We meet with the H.U.G. students to review what the program is overall and how to set goals. Mentor teachers are provided with various forms of data monitoring to help students set goals and reach them. As a school, we monitor our H.U.G. students (ESSA subgroup students) by tracking their progress on the FAST assessments and on the various district assessments.

Person**responsible****for**

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

**monitoring
outcome:****Evidence-
based****Strategy:****Describe the
evidence-
based
strategy
being
implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports. We will provide this support using Response to Intervention. Based on research by John Hattie, planning for tiered instruction using RTI has a 1.29 efficacy rate.

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based****Strategy:****Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

Response to Intervention (RTI) is a framework for implementing proactive data-driven decision making. It provides teacher with better, more timely information about students in order to improve student learning and performance. According to John Hattie, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29, while the average effect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning.

**Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this
strategy.****Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PLC #1 - review students in intervention from the previous year and set up intervention groups based on those students. Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Determine how to meet the needs of these students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions based on the decision rules and ICEL (Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner) strategy.

Person

Responsible Jen Schrader (jlschrad@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional learning through ERPL on MTSS system and structures.

Person

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

Implementation of PL of MTSS strategies following the District ERPLs.

Decision Rules guidance and ICEL Strategy; Tier 1 – 100% of students should receive Tier 1 and at least 80% of students should be meeting proficiency to indicate good quality core instruction. Tier 2 – 15% of students receive targeted level of prevention; Tier 3 – 3-5% of students receive intensive level of prevention; All students receive these supports in a stacked manner, including Students with Disabilities.

Person

Responsible Jen Schrader (jlschrad@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support.

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a Safe, healthy, and supportive environment. After reviewing our discipline data for the last two years, it revealed that office referrals, for offenses such as disruptive behavior, physical behaviors, and school rules violations, increased 87% in the 2021-2022 school year to a total of 178 referrals compared to the previous school year, 2020-2021, which only saw 95 office referrals.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Through the implementation of our revamped PBIS system, we will decrease our office discipline referrals by 20%.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored by conducting monthly data meetings with administration and the school counselor to review our EWS data, discipline data, threat assessments, and attendance. The PBIS team will meet quarterly to review the data collected at these monthly meetings and see if any revisions need to occur to ensure that our PBIS program is being implemented throughout the school with fidelity by all faculty and staff members.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a multi-disciplinary approach using the MTSS framework to help support the revamp of our PBIS Program. Outcomes will be measured & monitored by conducting monthly data meetings with administration and the school counselor to review discipline, threat assessments, and attendance.

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy: By implementing a School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Support System, we will be proactive in trying to prevent inappropriate behaviors by putting procedures in place and if needed changing the environment. We will continue teaching the students what we expect of them while on our campus by reviewing with our students the rules for specific settings, such as the cafeteria, media center, hallways, bus, and classrooms. We will use positive reinforcement by rewarding students when they show the schools expectations and when they follow the school rules. Negative consequences are still given for inappropriate behavior with a specific focus on reteaching the expectation to change the student's behavior, so the student does not display the same behavior again.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Introduce revamped PBIS program to faculty and staff during pre-planning.

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

During school wide events, such as Meet the Teacher and Open House, introduce students and parents to our revamped PBIS program. Review expectations with parents and students and provide pamphlets to families.

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

Conduct Pep Rally with students to review new PBIS expectations and procedures, as well as roll out our new acronym - FUEL!!

Person Responsible Jen Schrader (jlschrad@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly data meetings with the administration team and the school counselor to review our EWS data, discipline data, threat assessments, and attendance.

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

Conduct quarterly PBIS meetings to review the data collected at the monthly data meetings and see if any revisions need to occur to ensure that our PBIS program is being implemented throughout the school with fidelity by all faculty and staff members.

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

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS/PBIS systems and structures.

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Read-Pattillo has daily SEL time built into the Master Schedule. We are a PBIS school and we use the FUEL reward system. Students will be trained through guided lessons to model Focus, Unity, Excellence, and Leadership. They will earn incentive (FUEL Bucks) dollars when modeling these attributes. They will shop in the school store every week during the first month of school and every other week there after. The PBIS committee trains the faculty annually and meets quarterly to review data. As campus issues arise, the committee will meet to brainstorm solutions. Parents will receive information about the FUEL program in the welcome folder. SEL is also part of the Parent Night training sessions. Our guidance counselor will support students through regular lessons as well as small group and individual guidance sessions. With improved Social Emotional Learning, the hope is that students will be more engaged in school and will attend regularly and on-time.

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

School Leadership Team will review the PBIS program with the teachers during pre-planning. Teachers will review what FUEL is and what it means with students during the first week of school. The Leadership Team will meet bi-monthly to review school data and problem solve an issues that arise.