
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Champion Elementary School

921 TOURNAMENT DR, Daytona Beach, FL 32124

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

Demographics

Principal: Angela Polite

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: C (50%)
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	CS&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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Champion Elementary School

921 TOURNAMENT DR, Daytona Beach, FL 32124

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>82%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>58%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Champion Elementary empowers its students to get better academically, emotionally, and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building Champions One Black Bear at a Time.

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
Inge, Rick	Principal	Principal
Dietz, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Brown, Michele	Dean	Dean of Discipline
Snipes, Buffy	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach
Dedea, J	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor
Enck, C	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Teacher
Haus, R	Teacher, K-12	PE Teacher
Williams, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	Mild VE
Herring, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Teacher
Meyer, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Teacher
Bond, Erica	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Teacher

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	105	95	75	93	106	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	19	21	11	23	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	19	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	5	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	4	1	0	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	0	

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

51

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/19/2019

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	0
One or more suspensions	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
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	45%	56%	57%	43%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	56%	58%	48%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	53%	41%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	59%	63%	52%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	33%	56%	62%	54%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	43%	51%	49%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	57%	53%	57%	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	105 (0)	95 (0)	75 (0)	93 (0)	106 (0)	104 (0)	578 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	19 ()	21 ()	11 ()	23 ()	15 ()	18 ()	107 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	4 (0)	12 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (0)	19 (0)	44 (0)	75 (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	51%	58%	-7%	58%	-7%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	54%	-19%	58%	-23%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	59%	-23%	64%	-28%
	2018	40%	60%	-20%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	26%	54%	-28%	60%	-34%
	2018	33%	57%	-24%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	56%	-11%	53%	-8%
	2018	37%	56%	-19%	55%	-18%
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	29	29	25	22	15	28				

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
ELL		60			60						
ASN	90			80							
BLK	28	29	32	23	21	21	50				
HSP	37	43		35	30		42				
MUL	59			56							
WHT	59	56	43	55	39	27	50				
FRL	42	44	39	37	32	27	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	20	28	47	30	29	29	19				
ASN	75			75							
BLK	28	33	43	29	35	35	26				
HSP	36	24		20	14						
MUL	39	33		41	36						
WHT	55	44	31	55	33	15	54				
FRL	40	37	42	40	35	24	37				
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	25	41	32	30	49	52	37				
ASN	67			83							
BLK	26	39	33	41	41	37	39				
HSP	50	27		59	55						
MUL	50	50		33	40						
WHT	52	55	41	58	63	67	68				
FRL	38	44	40	50	54	53	54				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	280
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

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	60
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
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	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
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	47
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile 30% proficient. Contributing factors: Drop in 5th grade proficiency, insufficient resources, teacher lack of knowledge/understanding the standards, not knowing how to fill gaps, and lack of student prior knowledge to build on.

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

Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile 37% proficient. Contributing factors: Insufficient resources, poverty barriers, and lack of knowledge/understanding standards.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average was proficiency in Math. 3rd grade 10 points below the state standard, 4th grade 28 points below the state standard, and 5th grade 34 points below the state standard. Factors that may have contributed to this gap: lack of understanding the standards, lack of understanding student knowledge, insufficient resources, and not knowing how to fill learning gaps.

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

Science showed the most improvement at 49% (+9% change). We worked with District Science Department to plan and implement standard aligned lessons. We also provided Science tutoring.

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

Attendance and Level 1 achievement on ELA and Math.

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

1. Learning Gains of Lowest Quartile in ELA
2. Learning Gains of Lowest Quartile in Math
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 41%, Math Learning Gains was 33% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 30% which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on Math Lowest Quartile in order to improve Math Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our five targeted ESSA Subgroups, ESE, Economically Disadvantaged, Black, and Hispanic, that performed below 41%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math Lowest Quartile from 30% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rick Inge (rringe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards Aligned Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based instruction ensures that teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets. The practice of aligning learning to standards also help ensure that a higher level of learning is attained, guides teachers in the process of assessment, and helps keep them on track for learning targets and objectives. According to Hatti deliberate practice of teaching through standardized aligned instruction leads to mastery of learning, this has a .57 effect size on student achievement.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for intervention, ESE, and ESOL support. 2. Departmentalize in 4th and 5th grade. 3. Facilitate Professional Learning: Learning Sciences International Leadership; Faculty Coaching and Professional Learning; Target Task Alignment; Focus Boards; Discussion Techniques 4. Administer i-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data. 5. Purchase instructional supports. 6. Conduct PLCs weekly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions. 7. Procure tutoring opportunities 8. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE, ELL, and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction. 9. Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions monthly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction. 10. Create coaching cycles to support teacher growth in standards-based instruction. 11. Conduct four learning walks with coaches and teachers during math instructional time using IPG tools. 12. Monitor instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Rick Inge (rringe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 45%, ELA Learning Gains was 45% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 37% which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve Math Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our five targeted ESSA Subgroups, ESE, Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic, that performed below 41%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 37% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rick Inge (rringe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards Aligned Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based instruction ensures that teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets. The practice of aligning learning to standards also help ensure that a higher level of learning is attained, guides teachers in the process of assessment, and helps keep them on track for learning targets and objectives. According to Hatti deliberate practice of teaching through standardized aligned instruction leads to mastery of learning, this has a .57 effect size on student achievement.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for intervention, ESE, and ESOL support. 2. Departmentalize in 4th and 5th grade. 3. Facilitate Professional Learning: Learning Sciences International Leadership; Faculty Coaching and Professional Learning; Target Task Alignment; Focus Boards; Discussion Techniques; Book Studies (TBD) 4. Administer i-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data. 5. Purchase instructional supports. 6. Conduct PLCs weekly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions. 7. Procure tutoring opportunities 8. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE, ELL, and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction. 9. Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions monthly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction. 10. Create coaching cycles to support teacher growth in standards-based instruction. 11. Conduct four learning walks with coaches and teachers during math instructional time using IPG tools. 12. Monitor instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Rick Inge (rringe@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).

N/A

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.

Communications go out to all stakeholders on school events and accomplishments.

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.

Cojunseling, mentoring and social emotional learning support is provided.

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

District level staff provides transitional support.

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.

Meetings.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile				\$225,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	312-Subagreements greater than \$25,000	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$225,000.00
			<i>Notes: Consultants to provide, professional learning, weekly coaching for teachers including establishing classroom conditions and routines supportive of rigorous teaching and learning, effective functions of PLCs focused on student evidence of learning, cognitive engagement in rigorous tasks aligned to academic standards, integrated tech tools to measure growth</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest Quartile				\$83,651.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$45,000.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Intervention Teacher</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,812.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement for Intervention Teachers @ 8.47%</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,443.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security for Intervention Teacher @ 7.65%</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$6,372.00
			<i>Notes: Insurance for Intervention Teacher @ \$6,327</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$104.00
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance for Intervention Teacher @ .2304%</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$675.00
			<i>Notes: Workmen's Comp for Intervention Teacher @ 1.50%</i>			
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$22,000.00
			<i>Notes: Subs \$100/day x 44 teachers x 5 days</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$1,683.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute social security @ 7.65%</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	2734 - Champion Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$562.63
			<i>Notes: Materials and Supplies student consumables</i>			
					Total:	\$313,212.63