Pathways Elementary School

2021-22 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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.](http://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
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	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	Assistant instructional leader of the school. Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Flannery, Heidi	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach - providing coaching and support for teachers. Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary.
Fabullich, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 5th grade teacher and part of the school leadership team.
Graf, Leah	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 1st 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.
Lubas, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. 4th 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.
Veracka, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	Promotes school improvement activities and strategies for Pathways Elementary. Physical Education teacher and part of the school leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Joshua Jackson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

677

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

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

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/9/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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	67	91	95	97	119	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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	67	91	95	97	119	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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
03	2021					
	2019	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					

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**
03	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	61%	56%	5%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

1-5 ELA iReady
1-5 Math iReady
5 Science District Assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	90 / 25.66%	97 / 46.39%	100 / 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49 / 20.41%	51 / 31.37%	53 / 49.06%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 36.36%	11 / 45.45%	11 / 54.55%
	English Language Learners	2 / 0%	2 / 0%	2 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	87 / 13.79%	91 / 41.76%	96 / 68.75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46 / 8.70%	48 / 27.08%	49 / 59.18%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 18.18%	11 / 54.55%	11 / 63.64%
	English Language Learners	2 / 0%	2 / 0%	2 / 46.34%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	92 / 40.22%	100 / 62%	103 / 73.79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40 / 37.50%	48 / 56.25%	49 / 73.47%
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 20%	13 / 30.77%	15 / 26.67%
	English Language Learners	4 / 0%	6 / 16.67%	7 / 28.57%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	92 / 26.09%	100 / 43%	101 / 62.38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40 / 15%	48 / 41.67%	48 / 56.25%
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 10%	14 / 7.14%	15 / 26.67%
	English Language Learners	4 / 0%	5 / 5%	7 / 14.29%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90 / 61.11%	95 / 66.32%	103 / 75.73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47 / 51.06%	49 / 51.02%	54 / 59.26%
	Students With Disabilities	15 / 13.33%	16 / 25%	17 / 23.53%
	English Language Learners	6 / 16.67%	7 / 28.57%	8 / 37.5%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	88 / 23.86%	94 / 42.55%	100 / 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45 / 15.56%	49 / 32.65%	50 / 50%
	Students With Disabilities	14 / 0%	15 / 13.33%	16 / 18.75
	English Language Learners	6 /0%	8 / 25%	7 / 57.14%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	105 / 34.29%	117 / 47.86%	116 / 56.90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60 / 26.67%	65 / 35.38%	68 / 48.53
	Students With Disabilities	22 / 4.55%	24 / 8.33%	26 / 11.54%
	English Language Learners	5 / 20%	5 / 40%	5 / 60%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	105 / 21.9%	108 / 43.52%	112 / 63.39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60 / 10%	60 / 30%	64 / 48.44%
	Students With Disabilities	22 / 4.55%	24 / 8.33%	23 / 21.74%
	English Language Learners	5 / 40%	5 / 60%	5 / 60%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	114 / 47.37%	118 / 50.39%	110 / 51.75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55 / 41.82%	58 / 37.50%	55 / 43.75%
	Students With Disabilities	22 / 13.64%	22 / 8.7%	21 / 9.09%
	English Language Learners	3 / 33.33%	4 / 25%	3 / 76%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	112 / 25%	128 / 43.75%	118 / 61.02%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55 / 9.09%	64 / 29.69%	59 / 52.54%
	Students With Disabilities	22 / 0%	22 / 4.55%	25 / 12%
	English Language Learners	2 / 100%	4 / 75%	3 / 66.67%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	508 / 74%	459 / 81%	193 / 79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	238 / 61%	223 / 65%	95 / 73%
	Students With Disabilities	84 / 20%	81 / 38%	34 / 33%
	English Language Learners	14 / 100%	12 / 100%	6 / 100%

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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				

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	29	27	23	38	28	24				
ASN	72	64		78	82						
BLK	48	47	9	38	48	56	31				
HSP	54	40		48	44						
MUL	62	60		62	70						
WHT	65	54	38	72	68	48	60				
FRL	51	46	26	55	57	42	48				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
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	86
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	48
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	64
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	65
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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?

ELA achievement and learning gains remained consistent
Math achievement and learning gains decreased
Both ELA and Math lowest quartile made gains
Students with disabilities decreased in all areas of ELA
Students with disabilities increased in learning gains and lowest quartile
Students with disabilities decreased in overall achievement
Our African American population overall Federal Index score has decreased

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

African Americans ELA Lowest Quartile decreased from 30% - 0% (-30)
Students with Disabilities ELA Achievement decreased from 21%-19% (-2)
Student with Disabilities ELA Learning Gains (35%) Lowest Quartile (31%)
Students with Disabilities Math Achievement decreased from 18%-14% (-4)
Math Achievement Learning Gains decreased from 76%-65% (-11)

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:
Consistency with small group instruction
Knowledge of Standards

Actions:
PLC and PL time focusing on standards aligned instruction
Walk to Intervention
Intentional planning
Utilizing master schedule for small group and intervention time in both ELA and Math

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Students with Disabilities math learning gains increased from 38%-55% (+17)
Students with Disabilities math lowest quartile increased from 32%-54% (+21)
Overall science achievement increased from 64%-73% (+9)
Uti

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

Contributing Factors:
PL on math small group instruction
Following master schedule which included a math intervention block
Support Facilitation schedule

New Actions:
District support with science (Interactive notebooks)
Focus on small group instruction

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.

PLC time to focus on standards and instruction (Math and ELA)
PL and PLC time on intentional small group instruction (Math and ELA)
PL on interpreting data to improve instruction
PL on utilizing iReady to evaluate progress and drive instruction (Math and ELA)
PL and PLC on utilizing and applying data to support SWD and African American students

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

Utilize a walkthrough document that will give specific feedback to each instructional classroom.
Utilize instructional coach to model and plan with targeted teachers.
Provide mentor teachers for all new instructional staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis data review, Math proficiency was at a 62% (-6%) for the 2020-2021 school year. Math learning gains was at a 65% (-11%) and our Math lowest quartile was at a 54% (+2)
Measureable Outcome:	Pathways Elementary will increase our Math achievement in our lowest quartile from 54%-59%.
Monitoring:	-iReady data -FSA data -Walk through data focusing on Teacher Clarity (standards) and small group instruction
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Aligned Instruction Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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 has an effect size of .62

Action Steps to Implement	
Identify students who comprise the lowest quartile in math for grades K-3 according to iReady Diagnostic 1 and share results during grade level PLC's.	
Person Responsible	Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Identify students who comprise the lowest quartile in math for grades 4-5 according to the 2020-2021 FSA and/or iReady results and share results during grade level PLC's	
Person Responsible	Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Conduct collaborative planning sessions during PLC's to plan for instruction.	
Person Responsible	Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Provide Early Release Professional Learning sessions focusing on small group instruction.	
Person Responsible	Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Provide Early Release Professional Learning sessions on standards aligned instruction.	
Person Responsible	Heidi Flannery (hmflanne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Conduct administrative walk throughs monitoring instruction and providing feedback.	
Person Responsible	Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Create a schedule to analyze district assessments and reflect on data.	

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

Offer a tutoring program specific to FSA to provide additional instruction time for the math lowest quartile

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

Provide small group instructional support in Math to the SWD subgroup through the service of the support facilitation team according to the IEP goals developed for each student.

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

Provide explicit 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)

Create a common language and process across campus for setting and implementing standards aligned student learning outcomes.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis we revealed that Students With Disabilities (SWD) had an overall achievement score of 19% (-2) in ELA . Our SWD who fell into our lowest quartile in ELA scored 31% (-1) and our SWD who made learning gains in ELA were 35% (-1)
Measureable Outcome:	Increase SWD overall achievement in ELA from 19%-41% Increase SWD learning gains in ELA from 35% - 41% Increase SWD lowest quartile gains in ELA from 31%-41%
Monitoring:	-iReady data -FSA data -Walk through data focusing on Teacher Clarity (standards) and small group instruction
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher-led Small Group Instruction Standards Aligned Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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 has an effect size of .62

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students who comprise the subgroup of Students with Disabilities (SWD) 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 a walk to intervention schedule for K-5 using iReady and FSA data

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

Provide professional learning on utilizing data to support SWD

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

Provide professional learning on planning for standards aligned small group instruction

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

Provide small group instructional support in ELA to the SWD subgroup through the service of the support facilitation team according to the IEP goals developed for each student.

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

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

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

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

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

Provide explicit 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)

Create a common language and process across campus for setting and implementing standards aligned student learning outcomes.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis we revealed that our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup had an overall achievement rate of 14% (-4) in Math. Math learning gains was at a 55% (+17) and our lowest quartile scored at a 54% (+21)
Measureable Outcome:	Increase SWD overall math achievement from 14% to 30%.
Monitoring:	-iReady data -FSA data -Walk through data focusing on Teacher Clarity (standards) and small group instruction
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Aligned Instruction Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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 has an effect size of .62

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students who comprise the subgroup of SWD 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)

Provide professional learning on planning for standards aligned small group instruction

Provide professional learning on utilizing data to support SWD

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

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

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

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

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

Provide small group instructional support in Math to the SWD subgroup through the service of the support facilitation team according to the IEP goals developed for each student.

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

Provide explicit 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)

Create a common language and process across campus for setting and implementing standards aligned student learning outcomes.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis data review, ELA proficiency was at a 66% for the 2020-2021 school year. ELA learning gains was at a 67% and our ELA lowest quartile was at a 50%. Further analysis revealed that our African American subgroup who fell into the lowest quartile scored at a 0% (-30)
Measureable Outcome:	Increase ELA lowest Quartile from 50% to 54% Increase African American subgroup who fell into the lowest quartile from 0%-41%
Monitoring:	-iReady data -FSA data -Walk through data focusing on Teacher Clarity (standards) and small group instruction
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josh jackson (jdjackso@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small Group Instruction Standards Aligned Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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 has an effect size of .62

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students who comprise the lowest quartile in ELA for grades K-3 according to iReady Diagnostic 1 and share results during grade level PLC's.

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 2020-2021 FSA and/or iReady results and share results during grade level PLC's

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

Conduct collaborative planning sessions during PLC's to plan for instruction.

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

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

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

Provide Early Release Professional Learning sessions focusing on standards aligned instruction.

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

Conduct administrative walk throughs monitoring instruction and providing feedback.

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

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

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

Offer a tutoring program specific to FSA to provide additional instruction time for the ELA lowest quartile subgroup. (grades 3-5)

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

Provide explicit 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) |

Create a common language and process across campus for setting and implementing standards aligned student learning outcomes.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, as well as our 2020-2021 school discipline data, we have found that our highest area of concern in physical/verbal aggression. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School will:
-provide a decision tree to communicate and assist teachers with actions to be taken
-implement PBIS
-identify mentors for students with high incidents in physical/verbal aggression (League of Mentors)
-provide opportunities for classrooms to intentionally implement various SEL programs (DARE, School Counseling, Sanford Harmony etc...)

Teachers will:
-utilize school PBIS plan and develop clear expectations within the classroom
-be proactive in recognizing potential behaviors and develop behavior plans
-conduct meetings with parents/guardians
-provide intentional SEL instruction

Data will be reviewed quarterly to modify needs and/or concerns.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

-PBIS
-School-wide SEL (Sanford Harmony, CHAMPS)
-Attendance and Tardy Policies
-Teacher retention (new teacher support group)
-Coaching Culture
-After School Clubs
-Celebrations & Traditions
-Active PTA
-Monthly SAC Meetings
-Fostering Student Leaders (safety patrol, student council, awards)
-Safety Plan and Procedures

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

PBIS Team
- Samantha Fabulich (5th grade gifted)
- Terri Lubas (4th grade)
- Stephanie Georg (School Counselor)
- Heidi Flannery (Academic Coach)
- Cheryl Barrett (Kindergarten)
- Natalie Veracka (PE)
- Leah Graf (1st Grade)
- Matt Coleman (3rd Grade)
- Kacie Fuller (ESE)
- Ann Busse (ESE)
School Advisory Council with parent, faculty, staff and community members
Involved PTA
School Leadership Team
-Courtney LeCates (K)
-Leah Graf (1st)

-Jo-Anne Blum (2nd)
-Julie Zimmerer (3rd)
-Terri Lubas (4th)
-Samantha Fabulich (5th)
-Natalie Veracka (Special Area)
-Jessica Hatten (ESE Mild)
-James Taylor (ESE Multi)
-Heidi Flannery (Academic Coach)
-Josh Jackson (Principal)
-Tranesha Jefferson (Assistant Principal)
6 Community Business Partners

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 successes.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**