
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Ivy Hawn Charter School Of The Arts

565 S LAKEVIEW DR UNIT 110, Lake Helen, FL 32744

<http://www.ivyhawnschool.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Danielle Suhr

Start Date for this Principal: 6/5/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	54%
2018-19 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	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (73%)
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

N/A

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Ivy Hawn Charter School Of The Arts

565 S LAKEVIEW DR UNIT 110, Lake Helen, FL 32744

<http://www.ivyhawnschool.com/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	31%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

To foster intelligence, individuality, and artistry for a lifetime.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive superior 21st century education. (Adopted from Volusia County Schools)

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barsanti-Ventura, Anna	Assistant Principal	Elementary Assistant Principal- oversees curriculum, elementary schedules, professional development for faculty, safety and security, transportation
Drager, Desiree	Assistant Principal	Data Analysis, Master Schedule, Grading, ELA Coordinator, Testing Coordinator, In charge of Middle School
Conway, Kelly	Principal	Oversees Ivy Hawn

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	72	72	72	72	132	132	133	132	131	0	0	0	0	948
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	5	1	5	7	7	8	14	0	0	0	0	57
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	4	8	34	11	21	19	0	0	0	0	97

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	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

948

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

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	3	7	4	2	3	13	10	6	7	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	8	34	11	21	19	0	0	0	0	97

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	1	6	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	11

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	72%	54%	61%	75%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	53%	59%	67%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	44%	54%	50%	43%	51%
Math Achievement	70%	55%	62%	69%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%	52%	59%	58%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	45%	52%	58%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	73%	61%	56%	67%	56%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	72%	78%	89%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	72 (0)	72 (0)	72 (0)	72 (0)	132 (0)	132 (0)	133 (0)	132 (0)	131 (0)	948 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ()	5 ()	5 ()	1 ()	5 ()	7 ()	7 ()	8 ()	14 ()	57 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	8 (0)	34 (0)	11 (0)	21 (0)	19 (0)	97 (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	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
	2018	80%	54%	26%	56%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	82%	54%	28%	56%	26%
	2018	81%	51%	30%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	69%	50%	19%	54%	15%
	2018	73%	48%	25%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	69%	47%	22%	52%	17%
	2018	74%	47%	27%	51%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	71%	50%	21%	56%	15%
	2018	81%	56%	25%	58%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	59%	1%	64%	-4%
	2018	86%	60%	26%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-26%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	81%	54%	27%	60%	21%
	2018	91%	57%	34%	61%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	66%	48%	18%	55%	11%
	2018	73%	49%	24%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
07	2019	73%	47%	26%	54%	19%
	2018	47%	44%	3%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	45%	29%	16%	46%	-1%
	2018	17%	37%	-20%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		28%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	56%	18%	53%	21%
	2018	81%	56%	25%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	70%	57%	13%	48%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	76%	60%	16%	50%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	68%	20%	71%	17%
2018	88%	66%	22%	71%	17%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	54%	20%	61%	13%
2018	73%	57%	16%	62%	11%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	55%	43%	57%	41%
2018	90%	55%	35%	56%	34%
Compare		8%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	45	38	28	45	37	30	58	10		
ELL	46	62	75	49	60	63	29				

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
BLK	61	53	30	59	58	31	60				
HSP	67	62	65	65	70	76	65	88	58		
MUL	60	54		67	31						
WHT	75	64	49	73	57	48	76	88	67		
FRL	64	62	55	62	57	51	61	87	56		
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	33	50	37	29	40	31	32	93			
ELL	33	27		58	64						
ASN	80	80		90	70						
BLK	74	65	54	60	59	44	55		75		
HSP	69	66	44	62	59	58	77	94	64		
MUL	75			75							
WHT	79	72	56	72	59	61	80	86	70		
FRL	72	67	55	64	58	58	75	84	64		
2017 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	35	47	42	35	53	52	27	44			
ELL	58	72		58	67						
ASN	80	80		80	50						
BLK	74	55	50	57	47	14	70	80			
HSP	71	64	54	66	55	44	50	89	70		
MUL	58	64		67	64						
WHT	76	69	48	72	60	69	72	91	80		
FRL	67	62	49	61	54	50	53	86	65		

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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	650
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Our lowest component levels are with Students with Disabilities. Overall ELA achievement is at 32.7%. Learning gains for the lowest 25% of this population is at 37.1%. Overall math achievement is 39.6%. Learning gains for the lowest 25% of this population is 31%. Overall science achievement is at 31.8%. Our SLT believes that since these students are learning below grade level (or more than one grade below), their assessment scores at the current grade reflects the deficit.

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

We did not do a SIP in 2017, but we do know that with the increase of 148 students from last year to this year, our ESE population doubled. With the increase of this population, we know our student achievement data for our for FSA has gone down.

Factors for this decline were:

- 1) going from 6% ESE to 12% ESE population
- 2) not having enough ESE staff to support these students
- 3) need to increase best instructional practices for students with disabilities

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

The following data components have a large gap compared to the state:

- 1) 35.7% of our ELL population made learning gains compared to the state at 49.6%. This could be in regards to differences in population.
- 2) 39.6% of our SWD population made learning gains in math, compared to the 43.6% made by the state. This could be based on population of students or services provided.
- 3) 31% of our lowest quartile with SWD made learning gains in math, compared to the 38% for the

state.

4) 50% of our SWD population scored a 2 on their Science assessment, compared to 31.2% scoring a level 2 at the state level. Also, 13.6% of our SWD population scored a 3, compared to the 18.8% scoring a 3 at the state level. However, we had less scores of a1 and more scores of a 5 compared to the state.

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

When comparing 2017 to 2018 achievement scores. science achievement showed the greatest improvement, from 67% passing to 78%.

For science, instruction, we added 2 new science teachers in 5th grade. In addition to new teachers, we increase d PLCs among teachers, including STEM.

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

Our main area concern from the EWS data is the state assessment scores of a 1.

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

1. Provide more training for instructional best practices to our teaching staff focusing on our SWD population.
2. Increasing ESE support staff members to help facilitate the increase in our SWD population.
3. Monitor, share, and discuss district and state data regarding subgroups in comparison to school, district, and state data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA and Math Achievement for SWD
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it showed that our achievement data for our SWD was at 43%. With increased best practice and differentiated instruction in the classroom, students with disabilities will have more opportunities for success and improvement with content mastery and achievement on district assesments and FSA assessments.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2020 school year, 50% of the SWD population will score a 3 or higher on ELA and Math FSA assessments from 43% in 2018.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Desiree Drager (dadrager@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	More effective and consistent small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on what the students need to learn next to move forward. Ongoing observation of your students, combined with systematic assessment enables you to draw together groups of students who fit a particular instructional profile. — Fountas & Pinnell
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review SWD data to finalize scheduling to ensure proper placement of students for interventions and support. 2. Facilitate professional development in restorative practices for SWD population 3. Facilitate professional development on UDL 4. Monitor small group instruction in classrooms through the evaluation process. 5. Analyze school, district, and state achievement levels on a consistent basis to monitor and evaluate progress of SWD population.
Person Responsible	Anna Barsanti-Ventura (ambarsa1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Learning Gains of SWD and Lowest Quartile Population
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it showed that our data for learning gains for lowest quartile of SWD was at 37% for ELA and 31% for math. With increased progress monitoring through the use of disaggregated subgroup data, the school will be able to monitor and alter instructional practices in the classroom to better meet the needs of the lowest quartile.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of 2020, our SWD population will increase their learning gains in ELA from 37% to 50% and in math from 31% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Desiree Drager (dadrager@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data analysis and progress monitoring of subgroups, focusing on lowest quartile
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers should provide explicit instruction to elementary and secondary students on regularly using achievement data to monitor their own performance and establish learning goals. Teachers can use students' data analysis to identify factors that may motivate student performance and then adjust their instruction to better meet students' needs. -NAESP

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with detailed assessment data for their upcoming students. 2. Teachers will analyze subgroup data for their subject areas assessed by standard. 3. Instructional plans will then be created based off of SWD and lowest quartile need 4. Conduct PLC meetings where current data is provided and discussed with classroom teachers and ESE support staff 5. Based on current need, provide interventions for SWD and lowest quartile 6. Continue to monitor progress and adjust instructional plans where needed
Person Responsible	Kelly Conway (kaconway@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).

Adding additional ESE support staff for SWD population

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

Ivy Hawn is not Title I

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.

Ivy Hawn is not Title I

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

Ivy Hawn is not Title I

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.

Ivy Hawn is not Title I

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

Ivy Hawn is not Title I

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA and Math Achievement for SWD				\$4,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	7621 - Ivy Hawn Charter School Of The Arts	Title II	948.0	\$4,800.00
			<i>Notes: Team Leaders will meet regularly to create a PST binder for all staff. The focus will be Best Practices for the Lowest Quartile.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains of SWD and Lowest Quartile Population				\$128,700.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	7200	799-Miscellaneous Technology-Related	7621 - Ivy Hawn Charter School Of The Arts	General Fund	948.0	\$125,000.00
			<i>Notes: Adding reading intervention teacher and 2 additional ESE teachers to increase support services.</i>			
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	7621 - Ivy Hawn Charter School Of The Arts	IDEA	115.0	\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Use of Wilson Reading Instruction Program for lowest quartile and struggling readers</i>			
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	7621 - Ivy Hawn Charter School Of The Arts	Title II	115.0	\$2,700.00
			<i>Notes: 2 ESE support staff members will be trained in Orton-Gillingham. This program will also be used for reading intervention for the lowest quartile or struggling readers.</i>			
					Total:	\$133,500.00