

Volusia County Schools

Pathways Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	14

Pathways Elementary School

2100 AIRPORT RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

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

Demographics

Principal: Greg Schwartz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/6/2019

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)	50%
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 Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: B 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

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

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Schwartz, Gregory	Principal
Principal	
Gabriel, Heidi	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Kent, Heather	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Pascoe, Carolyn	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Fuller, Christine	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Graf, Leah	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Zimmer, Julie	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Jefferson, Tranesha	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Roberts, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Fabulich, Samantha	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Kennedy, Andrew	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Wheeler, Pamela	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	104	102	102	126	134	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	24	11	20	22	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	4	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

61

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
-----------	-------------	-------

Students with two or more indicators

Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	14	8	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	2	0	5	3	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	68%	56%	57%	62%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	56%	58%	53%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	53%	32%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	68%	59%	63%	66%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	76%	56%	62%	64%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	43%	51%	45%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	64%	57%	53%	55%	58%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	104 (0)	102 (0)	102 (0)	126 (0)	134 (0)	134 (0)	702 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	24 ()	11 ()	20 ()	22 ()	25 ()	25 ()	127 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	11 ()	16 ()	30 ()	57 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	54%	13%	58%	9%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	56%	5%	53%	8%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

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 Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

LQ ELA 47% (+15)
LQ Math 52% (+7)

Even though our LQ gained, our ESE population scored lower than their gen ed peers. Possible contributing factors - not enough grade level standards aligned instruction

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

No decline in any category

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

LQ ELA

Even though our LQ gained, our ESE population scored lower than their gen ed peers. Possible contributing factors - not enough grade level standards aligned instruction

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

ELL students 35% change

Master schedule included an intervention block for K-5

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

FSA Level 1 Students

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

1. SWD
2. Black Students
- 3.

- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Math Lowest Quartile

Rationale As a result of our school data review, Math Proficiency was at 68%, Math Learning Gains was 76% and Math Lowest Quartile was at 52%. SLT decided to focus on improving Math Lowest Quartile and proficiency for all students. Two targeted ESSA groups, ESE and Black were identified as performing below 41%.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve Increase Math Lowest Quartile from 52% to 59%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy Provide consistent interventions

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy According to Robin Jacob, small group math instruction is a promising strategy for improving mathematical competency. Based on student data, areas of concern will be identified and targeted during small group, teacher-led standards aligned instruction.

Action Step

Description

1. Review Lowest Quartile data to create school-wide Intervention Block within the master schedule.
2. Utilize Special Area teachers to minimize/decrease students within Intervention Groups
3. Administer I-Ready diagnostic to establish baseline
4. Analyze assessment data to identify areas of focus and groups during interventions.
5. Facilitate Professional Learning on small group/interventions
6. PLC's for data chats focused on reviewing student groups and intervention planning
7. Administrative walk-throughs during school-wide Intervention Block with feedback
8. Learning Walks at Pathways and/or neighboring schools

Person Responsible Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	As a result of our data review, ELA proficiency was at 68%, ELA Learning Gains was 67% and ELA Lowest Quartile was 47%. SLT decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile to improve ELA Lowest Quartile and Proficiency for all students. Two targeted ESSA groups, ESE and black, were identified as performing below 41%.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 47% to 54%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide Consistent Interventions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Derrick Meador, small group instruction gives teachers a natural opportunity to provide targeted, differentiated instruction for small groups of students. Based on student data, areas of concern will be identified and targeted during small group, teacher-led standards aligned instruction.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Lowest Quartile data to create school-wide Intervention Block within the master schedule. 2. Utilize Special Area teachers to minimize/decrease students within Intervention Groups 3. Administer I-Ready diagnostic to establish baseline 4. Analyze assessment data to identify areas of focus and groups during interventions. 5. Facilitate Professional Learning on small group/interventions 6. PLC's for data chats focused on reviewing student groups and intervention planning 7. Administrative walk-throughs during school-wide Intervention Block with feedback 8. Learning Walks at Pathways and/or neighboring schools
Person Responsible	Gregory Schwartz (glschwar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Due to our zoning and the special programs that we offer, we would like to focus on inclusive practices and person first language for our students with disabilities. Our BPIE

team will be presenting to our faculty and staff our BPIE goals and steps to assure success with these goals.

Community Involvement - in addition to the many events we currently have at Pathways to involve our community, we like to focus on creating more opportunities. We are adding a Family Science Night and/or a family Cookies and Canvas Evening.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00