Pathways Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pathways Elementary School

2100 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Together, we will develop the skills, knowledge, and values needed to address challenges effectively in a rapidly changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Create life-long learners who are prepared for an everchanging global society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
jackson, Josh	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Brown, Michele	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Flannery, Heidi	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach - provides coaching and support for teachers. Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Sampson, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies. K teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Zimmer, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies. 3rd grade teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Kent, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies. 4th Grade teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Pascoe, Carolyn	Teacher, ESE	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies. 5th Grade teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Nolan-Dack, Christine	Teacher, ESE	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies. ESE teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Floyd, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies. 4/5 Gifted teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Georg, Stefanie	School Counselor	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies. School Counselor and part of the School Leadership Team.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our School Advisory Council, which is made up of faculty, staff, parents and community members meets once a month to monitor and discuss our School Improvement Plan. Drafts are available for all stakeholders to view and give feedback to during a specific window. Faculty and Staff are regularly working toward the SIP goals and they are reviewed at each PLC meeting (weekly) as well as every faculty meeting (monthly).

Performance Indicators:
ESSA Subgroup - SWD has a 30% overall Federal Percent of Index which has been below the 41% threshold for 3 years.
ESSA Subgroup - SWD has an overall 25% achievement in ELA
ESSA Subgroup - SWD has an overall 36% in Learning Gains in ELA
ESSA Subgroup - SWD has an overall 25% in Learning Gains in the lowest 25% in ELA
ESSA Subgroup - SWD has an overall 20% achievement in Math
ESSE Subgroup - SWD has an overall 36% on Learning Gains in Math
ESSA Subgroup - SWD has an overall 43% in Learning Gains in the lowest 25% in Math
ESSA Subgroup - SWD has an overall 25% achievement in Science

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Regular review of the SIP will take place at weekly PLC meetings, weekly administrative meetings and monthly leadership meetings where teachers, coaches and administration will be looking at and using the data to increase achievement. Revisions to the plan will take place as needed when data indicates that strategies and action steps are not producing sufficient progress towards our goals. A Mid-Year Reflection will take place by February 1, 2024 to evaluate overall progress.

Evidence used to monitor the SIP:
Classroom Walkthroughs
Student progress monitoring (FAST, Performance Matters)

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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**	
Absent 10% or more days	4	28	25	16	22	23	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	5	3	5	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	20	23	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	19	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	7

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	2	0	0	11	14	0	0	0	27

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	23	14	27	22	33	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	4	3	4	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	12	23	9	15	0	0	0	67

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	5	12	12	14	0	0	0	49

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	23	14	27	22	33	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	4	3	4	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	12	23	9	15	0	0	0	67

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	5	12	12	14	0	0	0	49

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64	52	53	67	53	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				55			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			50		
Math Achievement*	63	55	59	65	42	50	62		
Math Learning Gains				64			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			54		
Science Achievement*	66	62	54	65	55	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	59	45			46		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	264
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	4	4
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	61			
BLK	56			
HSP	75			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	66			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	47			
BLK	51			
HSP	55			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	64			63			66					
SWD	24			21			27				4	
ELL	30			30							2	
AMI												
ASN	58			63							2	
BLK	57			51			50				4	
HSP	76			61							3	
MUL	60			65			75				4	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	65			64			65				4	
FRL	49			46			49				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	55	36	65	64	46	65					45
SWD	26	36	26	20	36	43	25					
ELL	42			42								45
AMI												
ASN	47			47								
BLK	50	47	42	44	68	64	40					
HSP	60	47		54	59							
MUL	73	58		72	53		63					
PAC												
WHT	72	56	39	71	67	50	74					
FRL	57	51	38	54	57	43	52					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	66	67	50	62	65	54	73					46
SWD	19	35	31	15	55	54	24					
ELL	46			38								46
AMI												
ASN	53			53								
BLK	45			40								
HSP	61			61								
MUL	60			58								
PAC												
WHT	71	68	48	67	65	50	77					
FRL	52	55	36	49	54	36	65					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	53%	10%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	57%	16%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	55%	13%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	61%	4%	51%	14%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

According to our PM 3 data, SWD showed the least growth in both ELA and Math from the previous year, falling below the 41% threshold. Contributing factors include the inconsistency of small group targeted benchmark aligned instruction, exposure of grade level benchmarks, and intentional intervention instruction separate from grade level aligned small group using grade level resources, all which was shown through walk-through data.

Other contributing factors include:
15 new faculty/staff

Alignment of resources
Consistency of feedback and coaching

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

ELA lowest quartile decreased 14% (from 50%-36%).

Contributing factors that were identified in our walkthrough data include:
Inconsistent small group instruction using benchmark aligned resources
Management of structured time allotment for small group

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

According the PM 3, third grade ELA showed the largest gap with our school average being 73% and the state average being 50%. This was a positive gap.

Contributing factors:
Third grade team has taught together for 7+ years
Team is data driven
Intentional implementation of benchmark aligned lessons

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

Math achievement increased 6% overall. (from 65%-71%)

New Actions:
ESSER Grant Tutoring
New benchmarks

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance

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

SWD
Planning/Task alignment to the benchmark
Coaching Cycles
Feedback
PBIS

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Classroom walkthrough data and state assessments indicates a need for explicit and intentional collaborative planning that focuses on benchmark aligned instruction. Additionally, our Needs Assessment and Analysis, revealed that 26% of SWD reached proficiency in ELA and 20% reached proficiency in Math. With an increased focus on collaborative planning, and consistent monitoring of student and teacher actions we will see a positive outcome on student performance and teacher practice.

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

Student Practice:
By February 2024, 40% of our SWD will be able to score a 70% or higher on district ELA and math common assessments. By May 2024, 45% of our SWD will be able to score a 70% or higher on district and state ELA and math common assessments.

Teacher Practice:
By December 2023, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark aligned instruction (whole and small group) and benchmark aligned tasks as evidence in consistent walkthroughs.

Coaching Practice:
By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%.

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

Student Practices:
After PM1 and PM2, SWD student data will be desegragated and compared to state proficiency and growth trends.
45% proficiency will be the common goal in ELA and math for SWD during the 23-34 school year. After each common assessment, teachers with the help of the coach will track and chart this data to measure progress over time.

Teacher Practices:
Classroom walkthrough trend data will be collected and analyzed weekly.
Administration and coaches will attend common planning to monitor benchmark aligned planning of tasks.

Coaching Practices:
Administration and coaches will meet weekly as a team to analyze coaching support plan and data trends colleced to make adjustments as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Providing Professional Development: By providing collaborative planning weekly through intensive teacher professional learning, facilitated by district and school based experts and designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, and build capacity among staff.

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

Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC as evidence by Impact Results of the eMints Professional Development Validation Study.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Identify students who fall into the subgroup SWD and provide both faculty and staff a copy.
Evidence of Implementation: SLT Minutes
Evidence of Impact: Walkthrough Data, SWD Progress monitoring data

Person Responsible: Christine Nolan-Dack (csnoland@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

Instructional Coach with administration will facilitate weekly grade level PLC's to provide support on planning benchmark aligned lessons, and review data to make intentional decisions on instruction.
Evidence of Implementation: PLC Schedule
Evidence of Impact: Walkthrough Data

Person Responsible: Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly meetings beginning August 2023

School Leadership Team will walk classrooms in all grade levels weekly to monitor the delivery of instruction and transfer from PLC's
Evidence of Implementation: Walkthrough Schedule
Evidence of Impact: Walkthrough Data

Person Responsible: Michele Brown (mmbrown@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly walkthroughs beginning September 2023

Leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.
Evidence of Implementation: Leadership Team Agenda and Minutes
Evidence of Impact: Walkthrough Data, Tiering of Teacher data

Person Responsible: Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly meetings beginning August 2023

Provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of instructional practices.
Evidence of Implementation: Coach's Schedule
Evidence of Impact: Meeting Notes (Kiano)

Person Responsible: Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning September 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The Area of Focus is aligned to District Strategic Plan Goal #3: Provide a safe, healthy and supportive environment. Our Needs Assessment revealed that during the 2022-2023 school year we had a total of 380 discipline referrals with majority of those coming from hitting and striking.

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, Pathways had 380 referrals school-wide. Our goal is to reduce this number by 50%.

Student Practice: By May 2024, students will reduce referable infractions by 50% by implementing strategies taught through PBIS.

Teacher Practice: By May 2024, all faculty and staff will build a positive classroom/school community based on the implementation of Pathways PBIS strategies which will result in a 50% decrease in the number of referrals written..

Coaching Practice: By May 2024, the number of teachers receiving tier 2-3 support with classroom management/PBIS will reduce by 80%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored on a monthly basis at administration meetings and shared with all faculty and staff at monthly faculty meetings. Time, location, grade level, and offensive will be monitored through our school PBIS in order to increase core instruction for all students. Through weekly walkthroughs, administration will be looking for PBIS implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Providing Professional Development: By providing collaborative planning weekly through intensive teacher professional learning, facilitated by district and school based experts and designed to deepen content-based learning, support PBIS initiatives, and build capacity among staff.

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

Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC as evidence by Impact Results of the eMints Professional Development Validation Study.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

The Pathways Elementary PBIS Team will develop the school wide behavior intervention support plan which will be implemented school wide by all staff. PBIS Team will meet monthly to monitor the supports that have been put in place for positive behaviors. Agenda and minutes along with our discipline data will be reviewed at each meeting.

Person Responsible: Michele Brown (mmbrown@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 14, 2023

Discipline reports will be reviewed monthly by administration and shared monthly at faculty and SAC meetings. Monitored through PBIS agenda and minutes.

Person Responsible: Michele Brown (mmbrown@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning August 2023

Utilize a guidance referral system to support students with behavioral concerns. Behavioral concerns will be monitored through the monthly PBIS meeting minutes and agenda.

Person Responsible: Stefanie Georg (slgeorg@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning August 2023

Develop and implement school wide PBIS incentive program to promote positive behavior that will result in a decrease of discipline referrals, which will be monitored through the monthly PBIS team meetings.

Person Responsible: Michele Brown (mmbrown@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning August 2023