

Volusia County Schools

Holly Hill School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Voges J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (43%) 2014-15: D (39%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Holly Hill School

1500 CENTER AVE, Holly Hill, FL 32117

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/hollyhill/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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

Holly Hill School is committed to empowering all students to become life-long learners and successful citizens through collaborative staff and community involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Holly Hill School, all students are empowered to become life-long learners through the interaction of all stakeholders that convey high expectations to students and one another.

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
Goropeushek, Audrey	Dean	Student relations for 5th to 8th grade.
Watson, Jason	Principal	Monitoring of school wide improvement plan.
Iannarelli, Heather	Assistant Principal	Monitor plan provide input.
Zablo, Michael	Assistant Principal	Monitor plan provide input.
Gronka, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	Monitor plan provide input.
Hanrahan, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Monitor plan provide input.
Brogan, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Monitor plan provide input. (Math)
McAndrew, Amber	Other	Monitor plan provide title 1/SIG input.
Cone, Mallory	Other	Community liaison
Glaenzer, Stephanie	Other	SIG-Early Learning Specialist

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	119	139	108	120	86	133	136	126	111	0	0	0	0	1078
Attendance below 90 percent	21	20	16	14	9	7	5	8	7	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	3	12	18	10	10	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	38	76	56	72	66	0	0	0	0	316

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	6	15	21	12	15	0	0	0	0	72

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	6	11	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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	14	26	16	25	13	24	26	20	18	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	1	17	10	17	17	19	32	39	42	0	0	0	0	194
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	3	12	18	10	10	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	38	76	56	72	66	0	0	0	0	316

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	2	11	13	37	37	38	40	0	0	0	0	180

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	35%	54%	61%	36%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	53%	59%	46%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	44%	54%	36%	43%	51%
Math Achievement	34%	55%	62%	42%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	40%	52%	59%	48%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	45%	52%	39%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	61%	56%	42%	56%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	72%	78%	56%	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	119 (0)	139 (0)	108 (0)	120 (0)	86 (0)	133 (0)	136 (0)	126 (0)	111 (0)	1078 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	21 ()	20 ()	16 ()	14 ()	9 ()	7 ()	5 ()	8 ()	7 ()	107 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	12 (0)	18 (0)	10 (0)	10 (0)	55 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	38 (0)	76 (0)	56 (0)	72 (0)	66 (0)	316 (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	29%	58%	-29%	58%	-29%
	2018	41%	56%	-15%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	54%	-18%	58%	-22%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
	2018	26%	51%	-25%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019	30%	50%	-20%	54%	-24%
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	28%	47%	-19%	52%	-24%
	2018	35%	47%	-12%	51%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	27%	50%	-23%	56%	-29%
	2018	35%	56%	-21%	58%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	32%	60%	-28%	62%	-30%
	2018	40%	58%	-18%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	59%	-26%	64%	-31%
	2018	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
	2018	44%	57%	-13%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	21%	48%	-27%	55%	-34%
	2018	23%	49%	-26%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
07	2019	23%	47%	-24%	54%	-31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	27%	44%	-17%	54%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	17%	29%	-12%	46%	-29%
	2018	17%	37%	-20%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	56%	-16%	53%	-13%
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	38%	57%	-19%	48%	-10%
	2018	42%	60%	-18%	50%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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	47%	68%	-21%	71%	-24%
2018	51%	66%	-15%	71%	-20%
Compare		-4%			
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	90%	54%	36%	61%	29%
2018	69%	57%	12%	62%	7%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		21%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	13	26	28	11	27	27	17	12			
ELL	31	44	33	38	47	39	41				
BLK	23	37	32	19	29	31	32	47			
HSP	40	46	27	42	46	33	44				
MUL	47	46		57	62		45				
WHT	42	46	35	41	46	39	54	66	82		
FRL	34	43	31	33	39	36	45	53	84		
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	7	33	35	10	32	38	14	6			
ELL	30	41	64	38	31	42	27				
BLK	25	38	40	29	40	42	35	46			
HSP	41	46	63	40	42	38	57	69			
MUL	43	42		34	33		33				
WHT	38	44	44	43	48	47	44	61	52		
FRL	33	41	44	36	43	43	40	59	67		
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	6	26	25	12	34	37	10	13			
ELL	29	44	29	44	55	55	40				
BLK	23	39	28	31	43	34	27	55			
HSP	42	52	38	51	52	50	45				
MUL	45	48		53	55						
WHT	42	49	38	45	49	36	49	54	67		
FRL	34	45	35	41	48	39	40	54	56		

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	41
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	31
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	41

Hispanic Students	
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	51
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 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	50
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	45
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.

- * ELA 35% Lowest Quartile at 32% which was 12% drop
 - *Math 34% Lowest Quartile at 36% which was a 7% drop
 - *Science 44% below District and State
 - *ESSA Subgroups Black 31% and SWD 20%
- Contributing Factors:
- *Lack of foundational skills
 - *Need for increased small group instruction

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

- *ELA Learning Gains Lowest Quartile 32% dropped 12%
- ELA Lowest Quartile ELL and Hispanic Subgroups dropped over 30%
- Contributing Factors:
 - *The ELL population continues to increase.
 - *Need to allocate resources to meet the needs of the students.

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.

- State MATH gaps 19%-34%
- Contributing Factors:
- *Lack of foundational skills
 - *Need for increased small group instruction

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

- Middle School Acceleration due to increase in Algebra scores
- *Tutoring
 - *Saturday Bout Camp
 - *Small group instruction

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

- * Attendance concerns from K-8th grades
- * Grades fourth - eighth Level 1 on State Assessment

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

1. Increase lowest quartile in Math
2. Increase lower quartile in Science
3. Increase lowest quartile in ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Math lowest quartile
Rationale	As a result of Math performance from the school report card 2018-2019, FSA Math. Math was decreased from 43% to 36%. Our SLT has decided to focus on Math Lowest Quartile in order to improve math learning gains and overall proficiency for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase math learning in the lowest quartile from 36% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction- Teacher-led
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction has .49 effect size according to John Hattie. Small group instruction allows teachers to differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize intervention teachers for Math Instruction • Review LQD/ Schedules to focus on student placement for interventions • Facilitate professional learning including small group instruction • Establish baseline data • Conduct student data chat (minimum quarterly) • Collaborate during weekly planning time (T-Time) • Walk to Intervention schedule to focus on lowest quartile gains • Attend Trainings/ conferences focused on SGI differentiation, PL and Math content / curriculum • Remediation and tutoring small groups
Person Responsible	Stephanie Friedman (snfriedm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase Science Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of Science performance from the school report card 2018-2019, NGSSS. Science was increased from 41% to 44%. Our SLT has decided to focus on Science Proficiency in order to improve science learning gains and overall proficiency for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase science proficiency from 44% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Rigor is achieved by the careful scaffolding of information tasks according to Marzano. Also, teacher clarity has an Effect Size according to Hattie of .75. Teachers will analyze the standards and create rigorous tasks at PLCs.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize coaches for standard based instruction in PLCs using strategies/ Data with collaborative groups • Schedule learning walks • Establish common assessments through collaborative planning with knowledgeable others • Use Essential Standards through Professional Development (unpacking the standards, vertical articulation, Fair game Standards) • Conduct for standards-based planning in PD for Collaboration • Establish intervention for students • Utilize IPGs/ Core Action 3 • Utilize coaching cycles • Schedule walk-throughs and provide feedback • Utilize Canvas for remediation
Person Responsible	Patricia Galbreath (pagalbr1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase ELA lowest quartile
Rationale	As a result of ELA performance from the school report card 2018-2019, FSA ELA. ELA decreased from 44% to 32%. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA learning gains and overall proficiency for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase ELA learning in the lowest quartile from 32% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jason Watson (jdwatson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction- Teacher-led
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction has .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and just Read Florida recommends small group instruction allows students to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner (SIPW pp.9).
Action Step	
Description	<p>Utilize intervention teachers for ELA Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review LQD/ schedules to focus on student placement for interventions • Facilitate Professional Learning including small group instruction • Establish baseline data • Conduct student data chat (minimum quarterly) • Collaborate during weekly planning time (T-Time) • Walk to Intervention schedule to focus on lowest quartile gains • Attend trainings / conferences focused on SGI differentiation, PL and ELA content / curriculum • Remediation and tutoring small groups
Person Responsible	Lisa Dubrule (ladubrul@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).

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.

- Family Nights to encourage parent involvement and increase home to school connections across content areas including Math, Reading, Science and SEL or Technology.
- FACT Fairs
- Provide supplies to homeless
- Business partners increased through active involvement
- Outreach programs for families and community including Adopt a Block

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

- Guidance Counselors for Elementary and Middle Schools
- SEL Counselors (TOAs) for Elementary and Middle write weekly curriculum.
- SEL Room
- House Behavior System
- Counselors and mentors through outside agencies

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

- Kindergarten family nights to train parents and support home to school connection
- DSC Reading Practicum working with students K-2 during extended day
- Additional personnel working with students on letters
- Increase blended learning experiences
- Early Learning Coalition partnership to provide resources to families
- AVID strategies
- Identify the needs of students
- Use of portfolios for transfers to high schools

At this time, Holly Hill School does not have migratory students. In the event, students are identified, we will revisit the SIP to include the necessary resources.

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.

- Inventory maintained
- Problem-solving activities
- SIG provides technology and technology programs in conjunction with Title 1
- Title 1 is responsible for adding personnel including Intervention Teachers and Coaches

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

- AVID visitations to high schools and colleges
- College T-Shirt Day
- Established partnerships

- Community field trips
- Programs
- Activities

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math lowest quartile				\$196,347.69
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$54,258.36
			<i>Notes: Elem. Math Coach, Stephanie Friedman</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$48,475.33
			<i>Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Adrienne Donald</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$46,665.00
			<i>Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Kamisha Payne</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$46,949.00
			<i>Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Lakeisha Byrd</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Science Proficiency				\$65,880.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$62,880.00
			<i>Notes: Science Coach</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Technology set aside</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Uniforms and supplies for homeless students</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA lowest quartile				\$259,906.90
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$78,115.56
			<i>Notes: Elem. Reading Coach</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$63,630.24
			<i>Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Sue Gallico</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$57,079.06
			<i>Notes: Elem. Intervention Teacher, Kim Johns</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A		\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: Attend academic conferences</i>			
			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Family Nights- personnel and materials/ supplies</i>			

			2721 - Holly Hill School	Title, I Part A		\$36,082.04
			<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>			
Total:						\$522,134.59