Chisholm Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chisholm Elementary School

557 RONNOC LN, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

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

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Marple   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	84%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (61%) 2014-15: A (67%)
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.

Table of Contents

Chisholm Elementary School

557 RONNOC LN, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

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

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	66%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

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

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 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.

Chisholm Elementary School, where we learn, grow and succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chisholm Elementary School is committed to ensuring the appropriate and engaging learning environment for all students that is inclusive of parental, family and community involvement.

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
Bowe, Holly	Teacher, K-12	First grade chair. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Daughtry, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Third grade chair. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Prokop, Leigh	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals. Works to support the principals in the school's improvement plan, day-to-day operations, and any other duty or task assigned by the principal.
Zablo, Craig	Principal	Principal. Works to oversee all aspects of the entire school including student achievement, state and district compliance, faculty and staff support and any other duty assigned by the Superintendents Office.
Grant, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Gifted chair. Oversees gifted PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and gifted program teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Dill, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	Fourth grade chair. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Roof, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Second grade chair. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Miller, Madison	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach. Responsible for supporting teachers with curriculum and teaching strategies.
McDonald, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Special area chair. Oversees special area PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		between admin and special area teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Distslear, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Fifth grade chair. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Dixon, Allaino	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten grade chair. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Griffin, Marla	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor. Responsible for supporting our students SEL needs and serving as laison to our local community.
Love, Becky	Teacher, ESE	ESE chair. Oversees ESE PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and ESE teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.

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	55	57	65	77	81	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	407
Attendance below 90 percent	4	9	4	10	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	10	6	5	3	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	1	1	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
33

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/23/2019

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	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	57%	56%	57%	66%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	55%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	46%	53%	32%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	59%	63%	76%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	56%	62%	68%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	51%	37%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	57%	53%	67%	59%	51%

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	55 (0)	57 (0)	65 (0)	77 (0)	81 (0)	72 (0)	407 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 ()	9 ()	4 ()	10 ()	8 ()	7 ()	42 (0)
One or more suspensions	10 ()	6 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	10 (0)	4 (0)	38 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (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	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	59%	-8%	64%	-13%
	2018	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
	2018	74%	57%	17%	61%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	75%	56%	19%	53%	22%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	7	19	22	23	36	35	23				
BLK	23	22	10	39	39	20					
MUL	33	20		38	40		50				
WHT	69	61	33	73	56	53	93				
FRL	44	39	25	54	48	40	69				
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	11	30	24	24	33	25					
BLK	29	28	27	39	39	31					
MUL	32	40		47	53						
WHT	76	67	38	80	66	46	88				
FRL	55	55	37	64	51	41	68				

			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	14	20	13	38	41	29	17				
BLK	30	25	18	43	53						
MUL	37	38		63	54						
WHT	78	64	47	86	71	33	76				
FRL	55	49	30	68	61	36	55				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
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	46
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.

FSA scores showed that our fourth grade had a 17 point drop in ELA and an 18 point drop in math. Fifth grade math had an 11 point drop and our lowest quartile in ELA went down 12 points. This is the first year we have seen such a considerable drop, moving down 6 points overall. More focus will need to be applied in student intervention and differentiation.

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

Overall fourth grade showed the largest drop moving down 17 points in ELA and 18 points in math. This cohort of students did well in third grade but showed a decline this year moving down 10 points in ELA and 11 points in math. Contributing factors may include new teachers in the grade level and a greater need for a more concentrated focus on student differentiation and intervention.

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.

Fourth grade showed one of the largest areas of concern. Fourth grade math for the state had a 58 and Chisholm scored a 50 and in ELA we scored a 51 and the state earned a two point increase moving to a 64. Contributing factors may include new teachers in the grade level and a greater need for a more concentrated focus on student differentiation and intervention.

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

Our fifth grade science well outperformed the state scoring a 75 compared to the state's 53 and in 3rd grade math we outperformed the state by 14 points. Although we have a tremendous amount of work today we are happy to celebrate these successes.

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

We do not currently have any students on the EWS report.

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

1. Math lowest quartile
2. ELA lowest quartile
3. Student social emotional wellbeing and growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Our math lowest quartile showed five points of growth moving from a 36 to a 41. We still have considerable growth to make in order to move these students up to grade level.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to experience 21 points of growth reaching a goal of 62% on the FSA lowest quartile math learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Craig Zablo (czablo@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher led small group instruction in math
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In working closely with our second grade team on deliberate and meaningful small group instruciton we saw tremendious growth according to our I-Ready scores. Delibrate small group instruciton is also supported by Dr. Hattie's research.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review FSA data for the whole school looking at specific areas and subgroups including ESE and minority students. 2. Use IXL as a tech based learning group. This will require the school to purchase the program. 3. Math small group professional development. 4. Data walks focused on small group and differentiated instruction 5. Planned Support including Text and curriculum professional development, Three Act Task Professional Development, Small Group professional development and Academic Coach support on a as needed basis.
Person Responsible	Craig Zablo (czablo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Our ELA lowest quartile learning gains dropped from a 36 to a 24 experiencing a 12 point decline.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to experience 38 point increase in our ELA lowest quartile learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Craig Zablo (czablo@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher led small group instruction in math
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In working closely with our second grade team on deliberate and meaningful small group instruciton we saw tremendious growth according to our I-Ready scores. Delibrate small group instruciton is also supported by Dr. Hattie's research.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review FSA data for the whole school looking at specific areas and subgroups including ESE and our minority students. 2. ELA PD on small group 3. Data walks focused on small group and differentiated instruction 4. Intervention teacher (Mrs. Susan Kennedy) working with students not receiving ESE support in the lowest quartile. 5. Wilson program implemented for struggling readers recieving ESE services in grade 2 and 3. 6.Planned Support including Text and curriculum professional development, Small Group professional development and Academic Coach support on a as needed basis.
Person Responsible	Craig Zablo (czablo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Student Social and Emotional Learning
Rationale	In surveys conducted by the school, district, and SAC there were numerous request for support in student behavior and social emotional development. Additionally, school discipline data showed an increase in discipline referrals moving from 388 in 2018 to 435 in 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome we wish to achieve is a 25% reduction in discipline referrals. Support includes a teacher book study on restorative practices, teacher training and support with Sanford Harmony, and lesson plans provided on the Canvas system.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Leigh Prokop (lmprokop@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Social emotional education and intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research published by Phi Delta Kappan showed that "compared to control students, students participating in SEL programs showed significantly more positive outcomes with respect to enhanced SEL skills, attitudes, positive social behavior, and academic performance, and significantly lower levels of conduct problems and emotional distress." Additionally, the higher academic performance of SEL program participants translated into an 11 percentile-point gain in achievement, suggesting that SEL programs tend to bolster, rather than detract from, students' academic success.

Action Step	
Description	1. Add 20 minutes of social emotional learning in every classroom to the master schedule. 2. Support social emotional learning through the Sanford-Harmony program 3. Provide class level social emotional education through the guidance department. 4. Implement a positive referral and kindness program rewarding students for acts of kindess and good deeds. 5. Provide mentors and check-in and out program to support struggling students. 6. Guidance Counselor will follow-up with teacher on the use of Sanford harmony materials and provide support where needed.
Person Responsible	Leigh Prokop (lmprokop@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).

In order to support our math lowest quartile and ELA lowest quartile we will be implementing a tutoring program. Members from the community, including retired educators will come in to work with our students in the lowest quartile and increase their academic achievement. This will be facilitated through our guidance department. Additionally, community mentors will volunteer to work with our students on life skills and guide them through obstacles they may be facing.

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.

NA -- We are 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.

NA -- We are 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.

NA -- We are 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.

NA -- We are 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.

NA -- We are not Title I

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile				$3,375.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1100	360-Rentals	0949 - Chisholm Elementary School	Other	1.0	$3,375.00
			Notes: Notes: Purchase of IXL for grades K-5 for the 2019-2020 school year.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest Quartile				$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Social and Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$3,375.00