Chisholm Elementary School

2020-21 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: 6/3/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 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%)
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	64%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
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 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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Norman, Johna	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.
Marple, Melissa	Principal	The principal manages all school operations including the development, monitoring and implementation of the school improvement plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/3/2020, Melissa Marple

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 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%)
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](#).	

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	38	66	61	71	78	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	402
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	3	10	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	1	1	5	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	1	3	2	8	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	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
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	

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	
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	

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%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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	

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	2
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	1
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Due to COVID 19 and the cancelation of FSA testing, data from the 2019 school year is being used to determine needs. We have had a steady decline in ELA across the board from 2018 to 2019. This includes an 8% drop in both ELA achievement and learning gains. The greatest area of concern is the ELA lowest quartile at 24% which is 22% below the district average. Additionally, our ESSA subgroups of Black, Multiracial, and Students with disabilities are an area of concern. Our ELA achievement for these subgroups are 23%, 33% and 7% respectively, all well below and the district and state levels.

Contributing factors include the construction occurring on campus and new teacher or new to grade level teachers in testing grades and ESE positions

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

At the school level the greatest area of decline was our ELA lowest 25% with a 12% decline from the previous year. Drilling down deeper into the cohort data indicates that there was a substantial drop in 4th grade with a 17 point decline in ELA and 18 points in math. Using I-ready data from the 2019-20 school year, 4th grade continues to be a concern with only 34% of students meeting typical growth.

There were also large declines across the board within the ESSA subgroups. Students with disabilities saw a 11 point drop in learning gains, black students in the ELA lowest quartile had a 17 point decline, and Multiracial students had a 20 point decline in ELA learning gains. Although the largest area of decline is in ELA, most categories and subcategories in math also declined with the exception of the math lowest quartile with a 5 point increase.

Contributing factors include the construction occurring on campus and new teacher or new to grade level teachers in testing grades and ESE positions.

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.

Chisholm's ELA lowest 25th percentile scored a 24% and the state reported a 53%. We are currently performing 29% lower than the state in this category.

Contributing factors include the construction occurring on campus and new teacher or new to grade level teachers in testing grades and ESE positions.

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

Our math lowest 25th percentile was the only area that we demonstrated growth moving five points from a 36% to a 41%.
Contributing factors may include a part time math intervention teacher that was paid for through Title I funding

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The largest EWS area of concern is our attendance. Approximately 11% of our students have attendance below 90%. Another area of concern is suspensions. Approximately 6% of our students have one or more out of school suspensions.

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

1. ESSA Subgroups (professional development)
2. ELA Intervention (WIN)
3. Math Intervention
4. Attendance Initiative
5. PBIS implementation

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Lowest Quartile At the school level the greatest area of decline is found in ELA with a steady decline across the board from 2018 to 2019. This includes an 8% drop in both ELA achievement and learning gains. The greatest area of concern is the ELA lowest quartile at 24% which is 22% below the district average and a 12% drop from the previous year. Drilling down deeper into the cohort data indicates that there was a substantial drop in 4th grade with a 17 point decline in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal for the 2020-21 school year is to achieve 50% gains in our ELA lowest quartile for the school. To achieve our objective we will need to increase our learning gains by 26%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Marple (mamarple@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement a number of strategies and resources to achieve our goal of increasing our lowest quartile learning gains by 26%. We will focus on providing professional development to our teachers in small group instruction, intervention resources, and data analysis. Additionally, we have added thirty minutes of reading intervention time which will be called WIN (what I need) time. During this daily lesson students will be group based on need and work with a number of teacher including grade level teachers, intervention teacher, ESE support facilitation teachers, and the reading coach. The school will be purchasing Ready Reading books to support small group instruction. This program will be used to support students at and below grade level. Last we will analyze student data on a weekly basis to make adjustments to our instruction and adapt the intervention and small group teams to best meet student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school has an incredible opportunity to show tremendous growth in learning gains for our lowest quartile. We are addressing this area with a multi-pronged plan of action: WIN Time: Building in WIN time into the master schedule allows students additional support in a small group setting with peers of similar performance levels with a variety of experts. Dr. Hattie's research indicating that interventions for students with learning needs has an effect size of .72 Ready Reading Material: Daily small group lesson with this resource will allow teachers to have a structured lesson geared to students at or below grade level. Professional development: Teachers and support staff will have a greater understanding of the identification, support, and areas of need for struggling readers. Small group instruction: A focused approach to small group instruction based on data analysis and research based strategies will allow us to better scaffold our instruction to meet students where they are performing and help to fill in gaps of knowledge and understanding. According to Dr. Hattie small group instruction had a .47 effect size in student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development in ELA content of other resources.- Melissa Marple
2. Meet with PLC and dive into the data to establish a baseline understanding of students needs.-

Madison Miller
3. Implement WIN time daily for student learning. -Melissa Marple
4. Implement structured small group instruction with Ready Reading. - Melissa Marple
5. Meet with PLC's weekly to examine data and make adjustments based on student performance - Leigh Prokop

Person Responsible   Melissa Marple (mamarple@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Lowest Quartile Overall we saw a drop in our math scores from 2018 to 2019. Our math achievement declined 7 points and our math gains saw a 8 point reduction. We had modest growth in our lowest 25 percent with a 5 point increase, however, we are still performing 10 points below the state average. When drilling more deeply into the cohort data 4th grade showed a 18% point decline and 5th grade experienced a 11% drop.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal for the 2020-21 school year is to achieve 55% gains in our Math lowest quartile for the school. To achieve our objective we will need to increase our learning gains by 14%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Marple (mamarple@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To address our goal of increasing math gains in the lowest quartile we will place math WIN time on the master schedule. Although we will not be able to implement a walk to intervention model for math, teachers will implement focused small group instruction with students based on their needs. According to Dr. Hattie, intervention for students with learning needs has a .77 effect size. We will also be able to differentiate lessons through I-Ready, which provides instruction at a student's level and focuses on filling gaps within the standards and the scope of curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To achieve our goal of a 14% increase in math we will implement a program that focuses on small group individualized instruction that is supported through data and collaboration. According to Dr. Hattie small group instruction had a .47 effect size in student achievement. Teachers will implement I-Ready Math lessons and curriculum aligned interventions to work with students in both small group and WIN times. Teachers will be supported with district based professional developments, the academic coach and administration.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development in math content of other resources. - Melissa Marple
2. Meet with PLC and dive into the data to establish a baseline understanding of students needs.- Madison Miller
3. Implement WIN time daily for student learning. - Melissa Marple
4. Implement structured small group instruction with I-Ready math - Melissa Marple
5. Meet with PLC's weekly to examine data and make adjustments based on student performance -Leigh Prokop

Person Responsible   Melissa Marple (mamarple@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There are three ESSA subgroups that have been identified as an area of concern; black, multi-racial, and students with disabilities. Although we see areas of concern in all assessed components our biggest area of need is in ELA. Students with disabilities scored only 7% ELA achievement, black students scored a 23% and multiracial students scored a 33%. To place this in context, our white students scored a 69. Our ESSA subgroups make up a diverse group of students with a variety of barriers.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to achieve 50% proficiency with our black students, 55% proficiency with our multiracial students and 20% proficiency for our students with disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Marple (mamarple@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our primary strategy to support our ESSA subgroups and reach our goals is professional development. We will reach out to district specialist in equality and ESE services to provide professional learning opportunities for teachers. This learning will aid teachers in better meeting the needs of students with disabilities and learning more about cultural difference and how to build better relationships with students from all social, economic, and cultural backgrounds.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When meeting with the school leadership team it was determined that a positive first step is to gain more knowledge about some of the barriers and struggles our students in the ESSA subgroups may face and develop tangible and measurable action plans to help address these differences. In the long term the team felt that working more closely with the surrounding community could have a positive impact on our focus groups. In working with the surrounding community and other stakeholders we will increase parent involvement, which according to Dr. Hattie has a .50 effect size on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Establish dates and times for professional development - Melissa Marple
2. Recruit district experts to provide professional development to our faculty and staff. - Melissa Marple
3. Work with PLC's to implement new strategies. -Madison Miller
4. Monitor ESSA subgroup data through I-Ready diagnostic results. -Leigh Prokop
5. Work with community member and stakeholders to strengthen relationships. -Melissa Marple

Person Responsible	Melissa Marple (mamarple@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Our three areas of focus are the lowest quartile in both ELA and math and our ESSA subgroups (Black/Multiracial/and ESE). Our other priorities address the concerns with our EWS data; attendance and suspensions. To address attendance, we will work closely with our school social worker and guidance counselor to develop a support plan for families who struggle with transportation or other factors that may contribute to truancy. The school leadership team will work to develop an effective school wide attendance initiative to provide positive incentives for school attendance.
We will be implementing PBIS (positive behavior intervention and supports) on campus to address behavior concerns. This will include a school wide positive behavior incentives, classroom and common area expectations, and lessons to ensure students and faculty understanding. When the interventions are unsuccessful administration will work to implement restorative practices in an effort to reduce suspensions.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

A positive school culture and positive relationships with our stakeholders are paramount to our success. In order to maintain and grow both school culture and relationships we will host a number of events and work to adapt our traditional format to align with new regulations.
We will start the school year with a virtual meet the teacher. This will allow parents to meet their student's teacher(s) and ask questions about the upcoming school year and policies and procedures. Traditionally, we host an open house and hope to be able to facilitate this event either virtually or in person.
In an effort to address our ESSA subgroup of African Americans and multiracial students we will host an African American Read-In. This event incorporates prominent African Americans throughout our community reading books to our students from African American authors or with main characters.
In order to meet our community and students on a virtual platform we will be hosting a weekly nightly bedtime story. This will not only work to promote literacy and the joy of reading but also work to extend our school, teacher, and mission into our students homes.
CDC guidelines allowing, we will also host other events include academic night, the gifted showcase, storybook parade, career night, GAP (grandparents as parents) and the lady cats show.
Mentors and volunteers have always had a tremendous impact on our students, faculty, and staff. We are working to develop avenues to allow students to work with mentors virtually and plan on inviting them back onto campus as soon as safety protocol allow. Last, we work closely with business partners and other organizations to provide information and incentives to our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$4,703.05
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1100	500-Materials and Supplies	0949 - Chisholm Elementary School	General Fund		$4,703.05
			Notes: Ready Reading materials			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$0.00
					Total:	$4,703.05