# Read Pattillo Elementary School

**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Read Pattillo Elementary School

### 400 6TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

### http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/readpattillo/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:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>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.**

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, 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 |
|---|---|---|
| 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. |
| Miller, Madison | 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. |
| Graham, Jenny | 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. |
| Aylwin, Kelly | Teacher, K-12 | As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| | | monitoring school wide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern. |

**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.

In the beginning of each school year we discuss the SIP, ideas, and areas for improvement. Several parents, business partners, and community members are involved in this process and support the alignment and development of action steps toward the measurable outcomes.

**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))

Through the leadership team, School Advisory Committee, and faculty meetings, the school will continuously monitor and recalibrate the School Improvement Plan using evidence-based decision making based on measurable outcomes and progress monitoring. The school will revise the plan midyear to make necessary corrections based on the data.

| 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** | Yes |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 28% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 96% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | Yes |
| **ESSA Identification** *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| **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)* 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 <br> 2019-20: B <br> 2018-19: B <br> 2017-18: C |
| **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 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 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 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

**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 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

**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 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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* | 54 | 52 | 53 | 58 | 53 | 56 | 53 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 54 | | | 53 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 32 | | | 31 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 57 | 55 | 59 | 59 | 42 | 50 | 52 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 72 | | | 59 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48 | | | 46 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 67 | 62 | 54 | 65 | 55 | 59 | 58 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 59 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 45 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 58 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 60 | 59 | | | | | | |

*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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 228 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 388 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| 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 | 18 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| HSP | 58 | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |

| 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% |
| WHT | 64 | | | |
| FRL | 50 | | | |

| 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 | 32 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 60 | | | |
| MUL | 53 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

## 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 | 54 | | | 57 | | | 67 | | | | | |
| SWD | 14 | | | 22 | | | 29 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | | | 22 | | | 27 | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 58 | | | 58 | | | | | | | 2 | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 46 | | | 54 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | 65 | | | 78 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 51 | | | 53 | | | 58 | | | | 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 | 58 | 54 | 32 | 59 | 72 | 48 | 65 | | | | | |
| SWD | 33 | 23 | 13 | 36 | 58 | 38 | 25 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 39 | 33 | 17 | 63 | 53 | 27 | | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | 55 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 45 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 57 | | 67 | 74 | 40 | 77 | | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 53 | 29 | 57 | 68 | 43 | 60 | | | | | |

| 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 | 53 | 53 | 31 | 52 | 59 | 46 | 58 | | | | | |
| SWD | 23 | 42 | | 26 | 50 | | 42 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | | | 19 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 60 | | | 30 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 42 | | | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 59 | | 62 | 65 | | 70 | | | | | |

| | | | **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 |
| FRL | 48 | 51 | 25 | 51 | 63 | 50 | 51 | | | | | |

**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 | 56% | 53% | 3% | 54% | 2% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 57% | 12% | 58% | 11% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 48% | 53% | -5% | 50% | -2% |

| | | | | **MATH** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 57% | -5% | 59% | -7% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 59% | 5% | 61% | 3% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 55% | 6% | 55% | 6% |

| | | | | **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.**

After reviewing the data from the previous year to the 2022-203 FAST scores, our 3rd Grade proficiency scores in ELA dropped 11 points from 59% to 48% of our students scoring a level 3 or higher, while in math we decreased 6 points from 66% to 52% of students scoring a level 3 or higher. Our 4th Grade Achievement scores in ELA increased 12 points from 57% to 69% of our students scoring a level 3 or higher and in math we increased 3 points from 61% to 64% of students scoring a level 3 or higher. Our 5th Grade Achievement scores in ELA increased 3 point from 53% to 56% of our students scoring a level 3 or higher and in math we increased 16 points from a 45% to 61% of students scoring a level 3 or higher. In science we increased 0 points from 65% to 65% of our fifth grade students scoring a level 3 or higher.

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

The areas that have the greatest need for improvement are 3rd grade ELA proficiency (48%) and SWD (32% overall students
scoring a level 3 or higher) and Black/African American Students (36% overall students scoring a level 3 or higher). We attribute cohort deficiencies and learning gaps to this decline, adversely affecting those already below grade level historically and demographically along with attendance.

**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.**

The data components that showed the most improvement are 3rd grade math proficiency with a difference of 7 points and 3rd grade ELA proficiency with a difference of 2 points.

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

The largest subcomponent showing growth was with the 5th grade math cohort which increased 16 points from a 45% to 61%. We attribute small group, collaborative planning, and differentiation based on tiered student data to the growth.

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

Reflecting on EWS data, we have identified attendance below 10% and substantial reading deficiencies as our areas of concern.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA
#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups
#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support.

**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 ELA

### 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.

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% broken into subgroups as follows: 3rd - 48%, 4th - 69%, 5th - 56%. Our school proficiency for 3rd grade is below the state and district averages.
Our most vulnerable populations were adversely affected as outlined in our
ESSA area of concern. 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) which were below the
Federal Index (41%).

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

By May 2024, Read-Pattillo will increase ELA Overall proficiency from 58% to 62% with our ESSA subgroups increasing from 36% to
54% (Black/African American) and from 32% to 54% (SWDs). Teachers will provide standards-aligned instruction as made evident by administrative walkthroughs using the look-fors. Coaching cycles will be identified and built based on data from look-for tool. Students will show growth throughout the year as measured by Progress Monitoring 2 and 3.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom walkthroughs with
specific look-fors as they relate to ELA, to include small group instruction and Response to Intervention (tiered instruction), precise planning using BEST standards, and collaborative planning during
PLCs. Additionally, we will monitor ELA achievement through student progress monitoring both formally (district assessment, verification of learning tasks) and informally (teacher tiering, Benchmark assessments).

Teachers and teacher practice will be tiered based on data from the Look For tools for differentiated coaching cycles. Student learning will be monitored using the ELA PM 1-3 data with a focus board created specifically to monitor students targeted for proficiency.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Kelly Lewis (krlewis@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.)

What Works Clearinghouse - Recommendations for Assisting Struggling Readers: provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills in small groups, monitor students' progress using a universal screener for progress monitoring.

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

Using curriculum that addresses all components of reading instruction and relatable content to students allows teachers to meet students' needs developmentally while still holding expectations high with task-alignment. Teachers will have high-level interactions with opportunities for practice and feedback.

**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 1 - Strong 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.

Administrators and Academic Coach will conduct weekly walkthroughs using the four look-fors outlined in the district initiative. Evidence of implementation will include quantitative (rubric) and qualitative (notes) data. Evidence of impact will be captured in teacher and student actions.

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

**By When:** We will monitor this piece each Wednesday during leadership meetings.

Using the data from the walkthrough tool, administration and coach will tier instructional supports to align best practices within the walkthrough tool to yield productive results; coaching cycles will be informed based on data.

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

**By When:** We will monitor this piece each Wednesday during leadership meetings.

Leadership team, along with identified district specialists, will plan and facilitate high-quality professional learning for staff.

**Person Responsible:** Madison Miller (mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Thinking Maps Professional Learning specifically aligned to ELA will be held December 5, 2023. Small Group/Collaboration Professional Learning will be held January 25, 2024. Tiered Instruction Professional Learning will be held March 22, 2024.

## #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 the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a Safe, healthy, and supportive environment.
After reviewing our attendance data for the last two years, it revealed that our average daily attendance, while at an all-time high of 92% averaged for all students on campus, includes 91 students who have missed 10% or more of school. The students who make up the 91% are predominantly identified in one or more of the underperforming ESSA subgroups (Black/AA, SWDs).

**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 and best practices identified through What Works Clearninghouse, we will decrease students who have truant absenteeism (defined as 10% or more missed days of school) from 91 students to 75 students by May 2024. Teachers will support PBIS initiatives by communicating with stakeholders. Students identified as having 10% or more truancy will receive tiers 2 and/or 3 interventions to support on-time regular attendance.

**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 social worker 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:**

Kelly Lewis (krlewis@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.)

Our evidence-based interventions relating to attendance in collaboration with data-driven best practices from What Works Clearinghouse, we have identified text messaging, phone calls, and mentorship programs.

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

According to What Works Clearinghouse: schools in which chronic absenteeism decreased implemented text messaging, phone calls, and mentorship programs with fidelity more frequently than schools in which chronic absenteeism increased. The study also looked more closely at one support in particular—text messaging to parents and guardians of students—to examine how implementation varied across schools. Some schools used a targeted approach for contacting parents and guardians of students who might be at risk for chronic absenteeism, translating content to reach parents and guardians in their preferred language; this could create opportunities to reach parents and guardians in ways that other attendance supports do not. Descriptive analyses showed that during the 2018/19 school year the use of attendance-related text messaging increased more quickly in schools in which chronic absenteeism decreased between 2017/18 and 2018/19 than in schools in which chronic absenteeism increased, where the use of attendance-related text messaging remained flat.

**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 1 - Strong 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.

Administration, MTSS chair, leadership team, school psychologist, and the school social worker will meet monthly to identify students on the EWS report and intervention data as it applies to support a decrease in students with 10% or more absences.

**Person Responsible:** Madison Miller (mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** We will monitor this piece each month during MTSS-driven meetings.

PBIS committee will comprise a system of evidence-based interventions to decrease truant absenteeism, both directed at parents and students.

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

**By When:** We will monitor this piece each month during PBIS-driven meetings.

Leadership team, along with identified district specialists, will plan and facilitate high-quality professional learning for staff.

**Person Responsible:** Madison Miller (mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** MTSS Professional Learning will be held October 18, 2023 (school-based) and again on January 10, 2024 (district-based).

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School improvement funding allocations are allocated to needs identified through careful analysis of data and input from the school leadership team. When looking at overall school grade data from the 2022-2023 school year, it was clear that priorities lie within ELA proficiency with a microfocus on our ESSA subgroups. It was noted using our 2022-2023 school year data that our students with disabilities' overall proficiencies in ELA were at 32% wit Black/African American students at 36% meeting proficiency. Both fall below the Federal Index (41%). Our second area of focus, PBIS as it relates to attendance, disproportionately includes students identified as one or more of our targeted subgroups. Resources including materials, technology, personnel, planning, tutoring, and professional learning were all vetted and specifically tailored with the areas of focus in mind. All areas of focus align with the strategic goals of Volusia County Schools.

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

**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

In Grade K, 20% of students scored below the 40th percentile. In Grade 1, 39% of students scored below the 40th percentile. In Grade 2, 28% of students scored below the 40th percentile. All primary grades surpassed the 50% threshold for an overall projected Level 3 proficiency score.

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

Within the 2022-2023 school year, Read-Pattillo 58% broken into subgroups as follows: 3rd - 48%, 4th - 69%, 5th - 56%. This is consistent with informal summative data coming from iReady as well as anecdotal information coming from the classrooms.

**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 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Within the 2023-2024 school year, Read-Pattillo will have 62% of students in grades 3-5 score at or above proficiency as it is defined by CSPM as measured by the FAST assessment in the third progress monitoring testing window. Specifically in Grade 2, Read-Pattillo will have 55% of students in grade 3 score at or above proficiency in ELA.

**Monitoring**

**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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Read-Pattillo will monitor the goal via the two prior CSPM testing windows, one at the beginning of the year
as a baseline and the other as a diagnostic measurement of progress. District assessments and formative
assessments in the classroom will serve as intermittent data points to create micro data on standardsbased
rubrics and checklists. Instructional leaders on campus will participate in StockTake twice during the school year to dig into the data and the practices therein.

**Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lewis, Kelly, krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us

## Evidence-based Practices/Programs

**Description:**
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. §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?

Decision Tree interventions that were state approved and evidence based will be the only interventions offered on campus (SIPPS, ABC Foundations, Kilpatrick, Stepping Stones, etc for foundational skills, Magnetic, iReady, and Benchmark Intervention resources for comprehension). These programs all meet Florida's definition of evidence-based. These programs all align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan based on decision tree information. All programs align to foundational standards and benchmarks as outlined in the ELA B.E.S.T. standards.

**Rationale:**
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All needs will be addressed using the district-provided decision trees. Criteria from the decision tree in conjunction with Ongoing Progress Monitoring will identify and support all stakeholders in defining criteria

for specific program use. The effectiveness is established through district norms and standards to determine effectiveness per targeted population.

## 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 |
|---|---|
| Literacy Team - a Literacy Team will be established at the beginning of the year to include the principal, assistant principal, academic coach, and intervention teachers. This team will meet periodically to assess both literacy goals and reliability of current resources. Additionally, the team will form actionable plans in the moment as it relates to the data, using the Goal #1 as a baseline. | Lewis, Kelly, krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Literacy Coaching - Read-Pattillo's literacy coach will establish coaching cycles with teachers based on need and preponderance of walkthrough data. The coach will utilize research- and evidence-based coaching tools to support teachers in increasing student achievement. | Schrader, Jen, jlschrad@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Assessment - all stakeholders will utilize assessment data to further inform practice and drive instruction. School Leadership Team will meet monthly to recognize deficits and plan data-driven courses of action therein. Collaborative Planning will be informed via up-to-date assessment data. | Miller, Madison, mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Professional Learning - Professional Learning will be tailored to the trajectory of assessment data coupled with patterns of areas of improvement in the school. Two MTSS professional learning opportunities will be offered to work with teachers in real time on identifying appropriate interventions and implementing those interventions with fidelity. | Schrader, Jen, jlschrad@volusia.k12.fl.us |

# Title I Requirements

## Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.


The School Improvement Plan will be disseminated via our faculty meetings, Title 1 Academic Nights, SAC meetings, PTA meetings, ConnectEd phone calls, Facebook, and VCS website found at https://readpattillo.vcsedu.org/.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))


Read-Pattillo Elementary, in keeping consistent with community values and traditions, will continue to engage stakeholders via multiple school-based events such as Title 1 Academic Nights, Kindergarten Readiness Night, and other events stakeholders identify as a need. All events and happenings can be found on the school's Facebook and VCS website found at https://readpattillo.vcsedu.org/.

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))**

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%.
Our most vulnerable populations were adversely affected as outlined in our
ESSA area of concern. The master schedule has been altered to allow for more collaborative planning among teams, departmentalization in intermediate grades, and common intervention times to tailor instruction as needed for adversely progressing subgroups of students. Additional support from intervention teachers has been identified based on school need with prioritized support targeting ELA blocks. Aligning walkthrough look-fors to support identified for the school will allow opportunity for growth in the area of high-quality instruction.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

Our Family Engagement Plan in alignment with our Title 1 funding allocations and identified areas of focus support the development and targeted support for our lower echelons of ESSA subgroups (students with disabilities, Black students) via both ELA supports and attendance initiatives. Part of the Family Engagement Plan allows for specific implementation of programs related to nutrition, local services, and resources and programs.

**Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

NA

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

NA

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

NA

**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

NA

**Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**

NA

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | $0.00 |
|---|--------|--------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |

### Budget Approval

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

No