# Pride Elementary School



# 2022-23 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: 7/1/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 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** | 2021-22: D (37%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) |
| **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** | CSI |
| * 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

# Pride Elementary School

## 1100 LEARNING LN, Deltona, FL 32738

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

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | D | | 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**
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 |
|---|---|---|
| Johnson, Elizabeth | Principal | The principal's role and responsibility are to lead teachers and staff, set goals and ensure students meet their learning objectives as well as overseeing the school's day-to-day operations means handling disciplinary matters for both staff and students, managing a budget, and hiring teachers and other personnel with teachers and other staff. The principal also is responsible for the safety and security of the school and meet all district, state and federal rules and regulations. |
| Sylvester, Lisa | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal role and responsibility are to lead teachers and staff, set goals and ensure students meet their learning objectives as well as assisting in overseeing the school's day-to-day operations, handling disciplinary matters for both staff and students, serving as ESE administrator, textbook administrator, and assisting with hiring teachers and other personnel. The administration also is responsible for the safety and security of the school and meet all district, state and federal rules and regulations. |
| Ebert, Emma | Teacher, K-12 | Mrs. Ebert is a MA intervention teacher. She provides personalized and small group lessons and activities outside of the whole group MA setting. She also assists the academic coach with teacher supports through modeling and lesson plan development. |
| Harvey, Timberlay | Teacher, K-12 | Mrs. Harvey is an ELA intervention teacher. She provides personalized and small group lessons and activities outside of the whole group ELA setting. She also assists the academic coach with teacher supports through modeling and lesson plan development. |
| Freed, Dora | Instructional Coach | As an academic coach, Mrs. Freed, Establishes Relationships with staff through building trust and rapport and builds trust through a confidential and non-evaluative supportive environment. She also facilitates professional learning, supports individual teacher professional growth and provides professional development follow up. She also facilitates and/or participate in grade-level PLCs and collaborative planning sessions in all content areas. |
| Morales, Carolina | Teacher, K-12 | Mrs. Morales is a ESE support facilitation teacher and the ESE grade lead. She is responsible for implementing student IEPs, supporting students when appropriate in specialized curriculum programs and meeting all district, state and federal regulations. |
| Caldwell, Jessica | Teacher, K-12 | Mrs. Caldwell is a 4th grade classroom teacher who teaches all core subjects. She is the team grade lead. She helps with lesson planning, collaborative planning and implementation of the SIP. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2018, Eilene Ahr C

**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.*

0

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

50

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

644

**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.**

11

**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 | 86 | 90 | 99 | 98 | 94 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 583 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| 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 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/2/2022

**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 | 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 | |

**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 | 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 | |

# 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 | 45% | 53% | 56% | | | | 49% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | | | | | | 53% | 56% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 28% | | | | | | 45% | 46% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 39% | 42% | 50% | | | | 55% | 59% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 34% | | | | | | 48% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 16% | | | | | | 29% | 43% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 51% | 55% | 59% | | | | 44% | 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 | 51% | 58% | -7% | 58% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 54% | -7% | 58% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 54% | -9% | 56% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -47% | | | | |

| 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 | 65% | 60% | 5% | 62% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 59% | -15% | 64% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 54% | -2% | 60% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 56% | -12% | 53% | -9% |
| 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 | 13 | 23 | 19 | 11 | 24 | 19 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 47 | | 34 | 26 | | 23 | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 48 | | 33 | 40 | | 50 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 52 | 28 | 43 | 38 | 19 | 59 | | | | |
| MUL | 36 | 40 | | 21 | 40 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 41 | 28 | 38 | 21 | 12 | 40 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 44 | 24 | 36 | 33 | 14 | 49 | | | | |

| 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 | 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 | | | | |

| 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 | 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 | | | | |

## 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) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 67 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 328 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 22 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 35 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 42 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 45 |
| 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 | 34 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Pacific Islander Students** | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| 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 | 32 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 38 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?**

The trends that emerged across all grade levels (3-5) is the need to improve student performance in all core subjects (ELA and Math). All grade levels and subgroups, except Black (42%) and Hispanic (45%), performed below 42% on the 2022 FSA. Science increased in proficiency by 3% from 48% to 51%.

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

The 2022 state assessment showed that the greatest need is student proficiency in ELA and Math. After reviewing the latest data from the 2022 FSA, it shows that Pride Elementary students performed lower on the 2022 FSA in ELA (45%) and Math (39%) than it has in last three years. Overall lowest quartile in math decreased to 16%

**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 are a lack of knowledge of standards by teachers, lack of benchmark-aligned instruction and student tasks during planning for lessons, lack of differentiation based on student needs, and lack of teacher commitment to student learning.

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

The most improvement shown was in 5th grade science proficiency which increased by 3%, and 3rd grade math proficiency.

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

Contributing factors include district support with planning and standards-aligned instruction for the only 5th science teacher and for 3rd grade math. Third grade teachers also collaboratively planned together after school.

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

Pride Elementary will implement collaborative planning for all grades, to include a structured protocol and lesson plan tool. Additionally lessons will focus on benchmark-aligned instruction and student tasks to ensure teachers are providing a strong core. Coaching cycles and PLCs will focus on building understanding of the BEST standards and appropriate use of the new resources in both ELA and math. Data-based PLCs will be implemented in order to track student proficiency, as well as growth from our ESSA subgroups.

**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.**

Strategies that Pride will implement to improve student performance will be standards aligned resources for all classrooms, guided support for teacher collaborative planning, creation of a leadership team to support all grade levels in curriculum and PBIS, a STEM teacher that will work with all students in the special area rotation in Math, Science and technology, data analysis session with support to identify student needs, PBIS resources and additional supports for differentiation through student small group intervention.

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

Teacher lead individual student data chats, weekly PLC data discussions, STEM lab, professional learning by district and school staff.

**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 Standards-aligned Instruction |
|---|

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the 2022 state assessment data, Pride Elementary school math and ELA data shows a drop from the 2021 school year. Pride's focus area to meet this need will be through on-going professional learning and support for implementation of the B.E.S.T standards in order to provide standards-aligned instruction and tasks to students.

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

Student outcomes: By February, Pride Elementary will increase overall math proficiency on benchmark-aligned common assessments to 60 percent which is an increase of 21 points, and ELA student proficiency will increase to 60 percent, an increase of 15 points.
Teacher practices: By May of 2023, 90% of classroom teachers will provide benchmark aligned instruction and tasks, utilizing knowledge of the BEST standards, as evidenced by walkthroughs.
Coaching practice: By April of 2023, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 support will decrease by 75%.

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

Monitoring will be done through frequent administration and district classroom walk-throughs using curriculum look-for indicators, coaching cycles, leadership team member data review sessions and intervention teachers progress monitoring, and administration and teacher data review sessions to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

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

Our evidence based strategy is standards aligned instruction in ELA, Math and science. This will be implemented through guided support for teacher collaborative planning, professional development in the areas of ELA and Math, and creation of a leadership team to support all grade levels in curriculum planning and implementation which will lead to improved teacher practice and student learning.

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

Standards based instruction is a process for planning, delivering, monitoring and improving academic content. John Hattie states that the effect size when teachers use teacher clarity is .75.

| 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.

Pride Elementary school teachers will participate in supported, collaborative planning during and after school, for ELA, Science and Math. This will be facilitated by the content coach and/or district Transformation resource teacher.

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

Teachers will be provided with professional development on the B.E.S.T standards to align instruction to the benchmarks, as well as new resources for ELA and Math.

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

Pride Elementary will create a school leadership team that will assist each grade level with collaborative planning, benchmark aligned tasks and guidance on look fors that will be indicators of implementation during walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible**     Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide coaching support based on walkthrough data. Tiered coaching support plan. Coaching schedule will indicate focus, frequency and method of support. Coaching logs will document support and next steps.

**Person Responsible**     Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Frequent monitoring of common assessment data will ensure progress is being made towards proficiency in ELA and math. Data from the FAST and i-Ready will also be analyzed and used in the decision making process for instructional shifts.

**Person Responsible**     Dora Freed (dgfreed@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.** | Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that our lowest quartile in ELA only reached 28% proficiency and 16% in Math, well below the district and state average. Further analysis showed that most of the students in our lowest quartile are also in one or more of our targeted ESSA subgroups, SWD, ELL, Economically Disadvantaged, White, and Multi-Racial, which were all below the 41% Federal Index. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Student outcome:By February 2023, 75% of students within targeted subgroups, will show proficiency on benchmark-aligned common assessments. Teacher Practice:By December, 90% of our teachers will provide intervention to our lowest quartile students/ESSA subgroup population with fidelity. Coaching Practice:By May 2023, the number of teachers recieving coaching in intervention programs and procedures will decrease by 85%. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | This area of focus will frequently monitor the interventions that were selected to ensure the fidelity and integrity of implementation. Additionally, frequent administration and district classroom walk-throughs using curriculum look-fors and program expectations will be completed by the leadership team and district support. MTSS data review sessions of LQ and ESSA subgroup student data, with teachers and administration/leadership teams, will be done 2 times per month during PCLs to determine the effectiveness of the intervention. Instruction, curriculum and environment will all be assessed (ICEL) during each PLC. The instrument for data collection will be related to area of need being addressed in each intervention session. Coaching cycles for teachers receiving tier 2 and tier 3 support, will also be utilized to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student proficiency, in the intervention block. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based** | Our evidence based strategy is student differentiation in ELA and Math through small group and intervention sessions. This will be implemented through the MTSS process that identifies student needs and student groups for intervention and differentiation. |

**strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

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

If teachers at Pride Elementary school use the MTSS process to identify student needs and develop student interventions student proficiency in ELA and math will increase. Student response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29 according to John Hattie.

### 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.

Teacher data review sessions with teachers, leadership team members and administration to identify student needs through the MTSS process.

**Person Responsible**   Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Pride Elementary school teachers will participate in guided collaborative planning with the academic coach, intervention teachers, administration and district curriculum supports to building lesson plans that address the needs of our students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention.

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

Teachers at Pride Elementary will receive training on the MTSS process through the schools ERPLs, PLCs and after school data analysis sessions.

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

Coaching cycles focused on intervention. Coach will provide schedule of frequency and level of support. Coaching logs will provide area of focus and next steps. Monitoring of impacted will be done through walk throughs, data analysis focusing on identified subgroups, and lesson plan deliverables.

**Person Responsible**   Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)

| #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Pride Elementary teachers wrote a total of 252 referrals during the 2021 2022 school year. This does not include the time that students were removed for time out or spent time with administration or the guidance counselor for social emotional support. Another issue that affects Pride Elementary was poor student attendance which affected student academic achievement and lead to high discipline issues. Starting a school wide positive behavior interventions and supports will improve student behaviors and also encourage students to attend school on a daily basis. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Student outcome: By Dec. of 2023, students will utilize strategies provided through PBIS in order to self-regulate, decreasing the amount of time spent outside of the classroom by 25%. <br> Teacher practice: By March of 2023, Pride Elementary will decrease the number of teacher written referrals by 25% reducing the time students spend out of the classroom utilizing the PBIS structures and strategies. <br> Coaching practice: By January of 2023, Coaching cycles for teachers struggling with classroom management will be implemented and monitored for effectiveness in the area of student on task data and reduction in the number of referrals. Coaching cycles will be adjusted based teacher classroom behavior data collected by the coach. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monitoring will be done through quarterly discipline review with the behavior leadership team members and administration. Coaching cycles will be monitored and adjusted based on behavior data observed by the coach. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Our evidence based strategy is a school wide positive behavior system. To help reduce behavior issues, Pride Elementary school will implement a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) school wide program. PBIS is an evidence based three-tiered framework to promote school safety and good behavior. PBIS provides school-wide expectations for all students and staff throughout the school. Staff teach positive behavior expectations to students weekly which allows students to know exactly what is expected of them. Students who follow expectations will be recognized and rewarded. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific** | Pride Elementary school will implement a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) school wide program. John Hattie states that behavior intervention programs has an effective size of .62. |

**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.

Pride will implement PBIS school wide through staff professional development, student assemblies and positive student reward systems.

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

The behavior leadership team will meet no less than quarterly to review school behavior data.

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

The behavioral leadership team will meet monthly to review implementation progress and to direct specific staff members to support any teachers in need or support.

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

Coaching cycles will be completed on targeted teachers based on behavior support needs.

| **Person Responsible** | Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

## RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2021 school city and classroom diagnostic data, Pride Elementary school's K-2 ELA data shows student proficiency rate has dropped from previous years. Pride's focus area to meet this need will be through on-going professional learning and support for implementation of the standards-aligned instruction, guided collaborative planning and specific interventions for students based on the MTSS process. Student outcomes.

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2022 state assessment data, Pride Elementary school's ELA data shows a drop from the 2021 school year. Pride's focus area to meet this need will be through on-going professional learning and support for implementation of the standards-aligned instruction, guided collaborative planning and specific interventions for students based on the MTSS process. Student outcomes.

**Measurable Outcomes:**
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Student outcomes: Measurable outcomes for Kindergarten and first grade will be through the Star Early Literacy ongoing assessments. Second grade measurable outcomes will be through the Star Reading ongoing assessments. By February, Pride Elementary will increase overall ELA student proficiency will increase to 60 percent, an increase of 15 points.
Teacher practices: By May of 2023, 90% of classroom teachers will provide benchmark aligned instruction and tasks, utilizing knowledge of the BEST standards, as evidenced by walkthroughs.
Coaching practice: By April of 2023, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 support will decrease by 75%.

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Measurable outcomes for grades 3-5 will be done through iReady ELA diagnostics and specifically, student achievement will be monitored through data points on the CSPM assessments. Students will show growth from the first PM data points taken in September to the PM 3 data points students will take in May.
By February, Pride Elementary will increase overall ELA student proficiency will increase to 60 percent, an increase of 15 points.
Teacher practices: By May of 2023, 90% of classroom teachers will provide benchmark aligned instruction and tasks, utilizing knowledge of the BEST standards, as evidenced by walkthroughs.
Coaching practice: By April of 2023, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 support will decrease by 75%.

**Monitoring:**
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitoring will be done through on-going administration and district classroom walk-throughs using curriculum look-for indicators, detailed coaching cycles based on 9 weeks reviews, leadership team member data review sessions and intervention teachers progress monitoring meetings, administration and leadership review bi-weekly data points, and administration and teacher data review sessions to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Johnson, Elizabeth, eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Professional development on the ELA B.E.S.T standards with district and school staff, collaborative planning for the ELA small and whole group block, and completing the MTS process for targeted student support in differentiation and interventions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Pride Elementary has selected the programs based on the research from John Hattie and what will have a great effect size to move our students to proficiency. Professional development on the B.E.S.T standards, and collaborative planning all fall with the area of standards based instruction and teacher clarity. This is a process for planning, delivering, monitoring and improving academic content. John Hattie states that the effect size when teachers use teacher clarity is .75. If teachers at Pride Elementary school also use the MTSS process to identify student needs and develop student interventions student proficiency in ELA will increase. Student response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29 according to John Hattie.

**Action Steps to Implement:**
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Professional development on the ELA B.E.S.T standards for teachers in all grade levels. | Freed, Dora, dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Guided collaborative planning with school and district support. | Johnson, Elizabeth, eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Data review sessions for MTSS and interventions for targeted students. | Sylvester, Lisa , lmsylves@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.**

Pride Elementary School will continue to involve parents in the decision-making processes and planning through School Advisory Council meetings, feedback received from parents on an on-going basis during conferences and other collaborative parent school opportunities. The process will begin with Meet the teacher prior to the opening of school by making parents feel welcome and inviting them to become partners in their child's education. The process of making parents and families feel welcome and motivating them to become involved will be ongoing.

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

Pride Elementary school will provide information regarding parent meetings using: Monthly Parent Newsletters, the school website, VCS Parent Portal, School Messenger, and teacher to parent on-going communication through Dojo, emails, conferences, and folders (when applicable). Information concerning assessments, curriculum information and the way in which it is assessed and data will be discussed throughout the year. These times may include Open house, student led conferences, School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conferences, IEP meetings, LEP meetings, and MTSS meetings. Progress

monitoring, data, including, but not limited to state assessments, and district assessments will be shared with parents during SAC meetings and parent conferences. Parents will be notified of SAC and PTO meetings in the parent newsletters, marquee, and School Messenger phone calls. The parent newsletter is sent home with students the first part of each month. Activities for that month will be on a calendar within the newsletter. Follow-up School Messenger messages will be made prior to the event. Parental feedback and sign-in sheets will be used to monitor attendance.