Pathways Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pathways Elementary School

2100 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

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

Demographics

Principal: Joshua Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2020-21: (62%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * 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.

Part 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

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	
jackson, Josh	Principal		Instructional leader of the school. Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Jefferson, Tranesha	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.
Graf, Leah	Teacher, K-12		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 1st grade teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Blum, Jo-Anne	Teacher, K-12		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 2nd grade teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Zimmer, Julie	Teacher, K-12		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 3rd grade teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Kent, Heather	Teacher, K-12		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 4th grade teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Veracka, Natalie	Other	Physical Education Teacher	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. PE teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Nolan-Dack, Christine	Teacher, ESE	TOA	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. Support Facilitation teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Kinsey, Lauren	Teacher, K-12		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. K gifted teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Floyd, Tara	Teacher, K-12		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 4/5 gifted teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Grunder, Melody	Teacher, K-12		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 4/5 gifted teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.
Georg, Stefanie	Guidance Counselor		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. School counselor and part of the School Leadership Team.
Smith-Flynt, Tammarynd	Guidance Counselor		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. School counselor and part of the School Leadership Team.
Fabullich, Samantha	Teacher, ESE		Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. Support Facilitation teacher and part of the School Leadership Team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Joshua Jackson

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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

11

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

13

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	105	110	103	115	119	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	14	27	22	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	12	23	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	6	5	12	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/3/2022

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	63	77	85	86	106	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	2	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	4	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	9	6	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	63	77	85	86	106	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	2	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	4	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	9	6	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	67%			66%			68%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%			67%			67%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%			50%			47%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	65%			62%			68%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%			65%			76%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%			54%			52%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	65%			73%			64%	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	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

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	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	56%	5%	53%	8%
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	26	36	26	20	36	43	25				
ELL	42			42							
ASN	47			47							
BLK	50	47	42	44	68	64	40				
HSP	60	47		54	59						
MUL	73	58		72	53		63				
WHT	72	56	39	71	67	50	74				
FRL	57	51	38	54	57	43	52				

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	19	35	31	15	55	54	24				
ELL	46			38							
ASN	53			53							
BLK	45			40							
HSP	61			61							
MUL	60			58							
WHT	71	68	48	67	65	50	77				
FRL	52	55	36	49	54	36	65				
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	22	36	32	19	38	32	23				
ELL	40			60							
ASN	84	87		92	80						
BLK	47	52	30	40	67	58	40				
HSP	61	67		57	86		50				
WHT	71	67	50	73	77	49	71				
FRL	59	59	42	54	67	46	52				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	47
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	55
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

According to our 2021-2022 FSA Resuts:

ELA achievement and learning gains increased by 1 point
ELA SWD overall achievement increased by 7 points
ELA learning gains went up by 1 point
ELA lowest quartile decreased by 5 points.
Math achievement increased by 3 points.
Math learning gains decreased by 19 points.
Math lowest quartile decreased by 8 points.
Math students with disabilities overall achievement increased by 4 points.
African American population ELA overall achievement increased by 5 points.
African American population increased in learning gains, lowest quartile and overall achievement in math.

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

When analyzing our 2021-2022 FSA scores:

Overall ELA learning gains went down by 12%
ELA lowest quartile went down by 14%
Overall math learning gains decreased by 19%
Math lowest quartile decreased by 8%
Our SWD subgroup falls below the 41% threshold in the area of ELA
Our SWD subgroup falls below the 41% threshold in the area of Math

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

Contributing Factors:
Alignment of Tasks
Alignment of Resources
Inconsistency with small group instruction
Inconsistency with standards aligned instruction

Actions:
Daily intentional and consistent Tier 3 interventions staying in line with our district decision trees.
Focused PLC planning using the four essential questions.
PLC's monitoring the progress of our Tier 2 and 3 students.
Coaching Cycles focused on standards align planning and instruction.
Coaching Cycles focused on meeting the need of our SWD population.
Walk through data (with feedback) monitoring pacing, benchmark alignment, and SWD instruction/ interventions.

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

Students with disabilities increased by 7% in overall ELA achievement.
In our African American subgroup we increased by 42% in ELA lowest quartile

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

PLC's identifying students who fell into the SWD and African American subgroups
Intentional planning for our SWD and African American subgroups
Collaboration

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

Standards aligned focus instruction
Intentional small group instruction
Consistency with master schedule
Coaching

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.

Support professional development by intentionally providing training on purposeful data driven PLCs
PL on deconstruction of learning targets and utilizing success criteria
PL on meeting the needs of SWD
PL on using data to plan for instruction
PLC's focused on standards aligned instruction
PL on collaborative planning using standards and instruction with a focus on identifying the power standards

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

Additional services and opportunities will include continual coaching support, providing specific feedback, modeling and planning support.
Utilizing our district PL opportunities.
Providing mentor teachers for all new instructional staff.
Weekly PLC meetings focused on the 4 essential PLC questions.
Monthly SLT meetings reviewing data and progress

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.	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 data review, ELA proficiency was at a 66% (+1%) for the 2021-2022 school year. ELA learning gains was 55% (-12%) for the 2021-2022 school year and our ELA lowest quartile was at 36 % (-14%). Math proficiency was at a 50% (+4) for the 2021-2022 school year. Math learning gains was at a 47% (-20%) and our Math lowest quartile was at a 36% (-14) Walk through data indicates a lack of explicit and intentional small group instruction aligned to the intended learning of the grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By February 2023, at least 70% of our Pathways students will show proficiency on Benchmark aligned common assessments in the area of ELA, Math and Science, according to the district assessment calendar. By May 2023, at least 90% of classroom teachers will provide standards aligned instruction as provided in walkthrough data.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Tiered coaching support plan iReady Data Instruction, curriculum and environment focused PLCs (monthly) School City Data FAST progress monitoring data Walk through data focusing on learning targets and success criteria and small group instruction/intervention. Trends over time showing: -teachers providing standards aligned tasks (whole group and small group) -teacher and student use of academic language -intentional planning during PLC's -growth in data trends aligned to standards based instruction as shown in walkthrough data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Standards Aligned Small Group Instruction Intentional Intervention Standards Aligned Whole Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	According to Dr. Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size and using the teaching strategies at the appropriate level of rigor for standards aligned instruction has an effect size of .62.

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.

Identify students who comprise the lowest quartile in ELA for grades K-3 according to FAST/CSPM and/or iReady Diagnostic 1 and share results during grade level PLC's. Create a plan to address Tier 2 and 3 instruction.

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

Identify students who comprise the lowest quartile in ELA for grades 4-5 according to the 2021-2022 FSA, FAST/CSPM and/or iReady results and share results during grade level PLC's. Create a plan to address Tier 2 and 3 instruction.

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

Conduct collaborative instruction planning sessions during PLC's specific to grade levels.

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

Provide Early Release Professional Learning sessions focusing on small group instruction and intervention.

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

Provide Early Release Professional Learning sessions on standards aligned instruction and intervention.

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

Conduct administrative walk throughs monitoring instruction and providing constructive feedback along with developing a plan for implementation.

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

Create a schedule to analyze district assessments and reflect on data and plan for instruction.

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

Offering a tutoring program to provide additional standards based instructional time for ELA and Math lowest quartile.

Person Responsible	Samantha Fabullich (swfabuli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide explicit and constructive feedback to teachers utilizing our walk-through document focusing on teacher clarity and intellectual student engagement.

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

Coach will facilitate Benchmark aligned PLC's

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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, we revealed that Students with Disabilities (SWD) had an overall achievement score of 26% in ELA (+7%), SWD who made learning gains was 36% (+1) and SWD who were in the lowest quartile who made gains in ELA was 26% (-5%) SWD had and overall achievement score of 20% (+6%) in Math. Our SWD who fell into the lowest quartile in Math scored 43% (-9%) and our SWD who made learning gains in Math were 36% (-19%). Walk through data indicates a lack of explicit and intentional small group instruction aligned to the intended learning of the grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By February 2023, at least 41% of the SWD at Pathways Elementary will show proficiency on B.E.S.T Benchmark aligned common assessments. (ELA and Math) By May 2023, at least 90% of classroom teachers will provide standards aligned instruction as provided in walkthrough data.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Tiered coaching support plan iReady Data School City Data Instruction, curriculum and environment focused PLCs (monthly) FAST progress monitoring data Walk through data focusing on learning targets and success criteria. Walk through data focusing on small group instruction/intervention and the additional supports that are given to SWD. Trends over time showing: -teachers providing standards aligned tasks -teacher and student use of academic language -intentional planning during PLC's -growth in data trends aligned to standards based instruction as shown in walkthrough data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher-led small group instruction Standards aligned instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based	According to Dr. Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size and using teaching strategies at the appropriate level of rigor for standards aligned instruction

| **Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | has an effect of .62.

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports. Classroom teachers and support facilitation teachers will utilize our district decision trees to make support decisions for our SWD. The potential benefits of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports were outlined in John Hattie's work and can yield an effect size of 1.29, when implemented with fidelity |

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 in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities in grades K-5.

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

Communicate the list with the Administrative Leadership Team, School Leadership Team, general education classroom teachers in grades K-5, self contained teachers of VE, mild students and the support facilitation teachers for grades K-5.

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

Work with teams in PLC to create an intentional intervention schedule using school driven data using FAST/CSPM, iReady and School City.

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

Provide professional learning on utilizing data to support SWD.

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

Provide professional learning on planning for standards aligned small group instruction and intervention.

| **Person Responsible** | Samantha Fabullich (swfabuli@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Offer a tutoring program to provide instruction time for the SWD subgroup focusing on grade level standards (grades 3-5).

| **Person Responsible** | Samantha Fabullich (swfabuli@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Monitor the progress of the SWD subgroup quarterly through PLC meetings and administrative leadership.

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

Provide explicit and constructive feedback to teachers utilizing our walk-through document focusing on teacher clarity and intellectual student engagement.

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

Coach will facilitate Benchmark aligned PLC's

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

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS systems and structures.

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy and supportive environment. Student behaviors, have increased in recent years as indicated by increases in incidents of physical aggression and increases in office discipline referrals. Physical aggression increased approximately 29% from the previous school year
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	In the 2021-2022 school year, Pathways had 98 physical aggression referrals with 37% of those referrals coming from kindergarten. Our goal will be to reduce the number of physical aggression referrals by 5%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored in the fall, spring and year's end through district focus reports on office discipline referrals. Time, location, grade level, and offensive will be monitored through our school PBIS PLC to increase core instruction in behavior for all students. Through monthly walk throughs, administration will be looking for evidence of PBIS implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a multi-disciplinary approach through district-wide MTSS framework. Outcomes will be measured & monitored through during our PBIS PLC's on a monthly basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PBIS is grounded in strategic analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-based Decision Making.

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.

Pathways PBIS team will attend district PBIS training, and identify goals for the 2022-2023 school year.

Person Responsible	Tranesha Jefferson (trjeffe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

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

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data. Share findings with SLT team and develop a plan to address areas of need.

Person Responsible	Samantha Fabullich (swfabuli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize a guidance referral system, to support students with behavioral concerns.

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

School wide training for students and teachers on PBIS expectations for each common area.

Person Responsible   Samantha Fabullich (swfabuli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide training on managing aggressive behaviors.

Person Responsible   Tranesha Jefferson (trjeffe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize school guidance referral system to support students in small group sessions who are demonstrating physical aggression.

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

Monthly walk throughs looking for evidence of implementation of PBIS expectations with explicit feedback on the classroom environment (safe, healthy and supportive)

Person Responsible   Josh jackson (jdjackso@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

n/a

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

n/a

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)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

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.

n/a

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

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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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

n/a

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.

Pathways Elementary address building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved by hosting events such as Meet the Teacher and Open House. During the 2022-2023 school year we plan to continue many of the traditions and events that we have held in the past such as: Donuts with Dad, Muffins with Mom, Veterans Day Celebration, holiday shows, grade level performances, Fall Festival, Math and Literacy Nights, 80's Night and Family involvement opportunities (such as a STEM evening or night at the Torguas). We have an active Parent Teacher Association and School Advisory Council. Communication is streamlined through one platform for all stakeholders, all faculty and staff on campus use Class DOJO to communicate and share happenings at Pathways. Teachers utilize PBIS to assist with making our school a positive environment as well as Sanford Harmony for Social Emotional Learning. Our school safety patrols help ensure the safety of all students while also being a positive role

model for students on campus. Pathways also utilizes the districts mentoring program, The League of Mentors, utilizing parents and community members to work with some of our needy students.

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

Each of our school stakeholders plays an important roll in helping develop and communicate happenings at Pathways Elementary. Through an open door policy with the administrative team, all voices are heard and play an important roll in collaborating together. Together we plan for improvement, problem solve and celebrate success.

Faculty and staff at Pathways reinforce positive behaviors using PBIS rewards and incentives while also rewarding students with positive points through Class DOJO. Teachers can submit positive behavior referrals to administration for special recognition for their student(s). Each week a student from each class is awarded the Terrific Kid title for demonstrating the weekly life skill. School counselors provide social emotional support by meeting with students in whole group, small group and individual settings. Community members help support our school with providing various incentives and many of them are also peer mentors. By bringing all our stakeholders together we help to ensure that Pathways Elementary has a positive culture and environment.