

Volusia County Schools

Chisholm Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 6/10/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	57%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	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	Position 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.
Distslear, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Fifth grade chair. Oversees grade level PLC's including the tracking of lowest quartile data, pacing, grade level trainings, dissemination of information between admin and teachers. Additionally, she acts as the liaison between admin and grade level teachers sharing concerns and providing input into school policies, procedures, and focus.
Grant, Jennifer	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.
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.
McDonald, Nicole	Instructional Media	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.
Miller, Madison	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach. Responsible for supporting teachers with curriculum and teaching strategies.
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.
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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
Marple, Melissa	Principal	The principal manages all school operations including the development, monitoring and implementation of the school improvement plan.
Moore, Kelly	Dean	The administrative TOA works closely with the EBD department to help provide support. Additionally, she works closely with the principal and assistant principal as a member of the administrative team to provide support in daily school management, discipline, PBIS, curriculum and instruction, and supervision.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, 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

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

460

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	61	79	67	81	84	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	31	7	3	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	4	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/9/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				57%	56%	57%	65%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	58%	59%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				24%	46%	53%	36%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	59%	63%	71%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	56%	62%	59%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	43%	51%	36%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				76%	57%	53%	77%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	59%	-8%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	75%	56%	19%	53%	22%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grade 1-5 ELA and Math show the percent proficient on the I-ready diagnostic assessment. Fifth grade science percentage proficient is based on students scoring 70% or higher on district science assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30.36%	40.68%	66.67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.73%	40.00%	61.54%
	Students With Disabilities	12.50%	11.11%	80%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16.07%	35.59%	54.10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.29%	32.50%	48.72%
	Students With Disabilities	25.00%	11.11%	20.00%
	English Language Learners	0.00%	0.00%	46.29%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35.71%	50.00%	63.64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.57%	36.59%	53.85%
	Students With Disabilities	5.00%	13.64%	22.73%
	English Language Learners	Blank	Blank	Blank
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24.07%	45.16%	54.69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.59%	41.03%	50.00%
	Students With Disabilities	10.53%	18.18%	15.00%
	English Language Learners	Blank	Blank	Blank

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59.70%	72.46%	78.08%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52.08%	64.00%	69.23%
	Students With Disabilities	12.50%	18.75%	25.00%
	English Language Learners	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10.77%	47.89%	70.83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2.17%	39.22%	62.75%
	Students With Disabilities	0.00%	12.50%	29.41%
	English Language Learners	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47.76%	58.33%	58.11%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.27%	40.00%	47.83%
	Students With Disabilities	12.50%	13.33%	43.75%
	English Language Learners	Blank	Blank	Blank
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32.84%	56.94%	71.83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.27%	48.89%	61.36%
	Students With Disabilities	12.50%	25.00%	37.50%
	English Language Learners	Blank	Blank	Blank

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38.27%	48.28%	53.66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.08%	34.55%	40.00%
	Students With Disabilities	7.14%	13.33%	23.08%
	English Language Learners	100.0%	100.00%	100.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31.25%	49.43%	63.41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.00%	40.00%	47.06%
	Students With Disabilities	7.14%	13.33%	21.43%
	English Language Learners	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	75%	86%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	80%	86%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	69%	80%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	58		40	64		36				
BLK	33			44							
MUL	52			57							
WHT	70	66	62	78	69	75	75				
FRL	52	50	46	66	65	50	65				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
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	71
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Across most grade levels and content areas Chisholm showed growth. In ELA achievement the school moved from 57% to 65%. In math achievement the school increased 10 points from 64% to 74%. Our ELA learning gains moved 10% points from a 51% to a 61% and our math gains also increased 17% from 51% to 68%. We also saw improvement in our target areas of ELA LQ increasing 29% from 24% to 53% and Math LQ increasing 20% from 41% to 61%. Additionally, this past year we focused on the ESSA subgroups of students with disabilities, African American students and multiracial students. Our students with disabilities increased their overall percentage to 47% and our multiracial students increased their overall percentage to 56%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2021 assessments our greatest need for improvement is our African American students who had an overall percentage of 29%. Additionally, we also would like to improve our performance in ELA and math LQ. Our ELA LQ scored a 56 and our math LQ scored a 61%. Although these areas did show tremendous growth they are the lowest scores we received. Last we will continue our focus on students with disabilities and multi-racial students. These categories no longer meet the federal index for monitoring, however we will still track them in order to continue the forward momentum.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The subgroup of African American students is an area that continues to need attention and focus. Although our African American students improved their overall percentage from 22% to 29% there is still much to do. Contributing factors vary from student to student demonstrating a need to build relationships with the students and also the community. Our ELA and math LQ increased 29% and 20% respectively. Contributing factors are the need for continued and focused interventions and instruction tailored to each student's individual needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2021 FSA and district assessments our largest area of growth was our ELA lowest quartile moving from 24% to 56%. We had growth in all categories including two of our ESSA subgroups; multi-racial and students with disabilities.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

This growth can be attributed to a number of factors. The school implemented a walk to intervention model for ELA and provided additional support for smaller and more focused groups with the academic coach, reading intervention teachers and ESE support facilitation. We also implemented intervention during the math block and received district support on structuring the math lessons to allow for more focused intervention and enrichment.

The school purchased Ready Reading to be used in small group and WIN time, as well as provided professional development on how to utilize this resource.

Next we assigned specific grade level lessons in I-Ready, so students were not only getting instruction on their performance level but also on their grade level.

We conducted monthly walk throughs to provide feedback and support in all academic areas and the

learning environment.

Last, we worked to restructure PLC's with administrative support and focus on specific students in our targeted groups. PLC's were curriculum focused and data driven.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Our students will continue to participate in WIN (what I need) time for reading intervention and enrichment. Students in each grade level will work in small groups receiving intervention and enrichment based on their needs as determined by progress monitoring in district assessments and in I-Ready. Additional staff will provide support during this time to allow smaller groups and more focused instruction.

Students will also participate in a math WIN within the classroom. The classroom teacher will provide focused instruction to enrich or provide intervention to students in math standards as determined by progress monitoring and I-Ready assessments.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We have scheduled professional development in Culturally Responsive teaching to help us better reach and support our African American students. To help our teachers better support our LQ we have scheduled training for I-Ready, teachers clarity, and will also provide curriculum training from resource teachers. Additionally, our teachers will receive training in Trauma Informed Care to help all students who may have had a traumatic event and how to best support them.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will continue to support our new teachers and look for opportunities help our veteran teachers grow in their craft. This will include continued professional development as well as weekly PLC meetings focused on progress monitoring and curriculum and instruction.

Additionally, we will continue to work on reaching out to the surrounding community in order to build relationships with all stakeholders.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to our FSA data our students in the ELA lowest quartile scored a 56%. This is our lowest area and one that we would like to continue to work on. Although the 2021 scores only took into account our 5th grade students for the lowest quartile, we understand that in the 2022 school year the lowest quartile grade will also include our 4th grade students.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to achieve 62% proficiency for our ELA lowest quartile on FSA testing.

Monitoring: We will utilize I-Ready diagnostic and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the school year. We have identified our lowest quartile students in 4th and 5th grade and will track their progress from the first week of school. This will entail not only frequently reviewing their district and I-Ready data but also monitoring them through their IEP or MTSS action plans, as well as reviewing their progress and needs weekly during PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Madison Miller (mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will be focusing on small group instruction. This instruction will take place during the ELA block as well as during the reading intervention block. The reading intervention block will be 30 minutes long and called WIN (what I need) time. During this daily lesson students will be grouped based on need and work with a number of instructors 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.

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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 new curriculum and I-ready resources.

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

Ensure the school walk to intervention model is in place and adhered to with fidelity. This includes frequently reviewing intervention groups and making adjustments based on the data.

Person Responsible Madison Miller (mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly review of ELA lowest quartile data with PLC's and administrative team in order to progress monitor the students in the ELA LQ.

Person Responsible Madison Miller (mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional development and support will be provided regrading the new ELA curriculum and resources. Additionally, I-Ready training will be provided to help teachers access more resources and better understand student data.

Person Responsible Madison Miller (mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to our FSA data our students in the Math lowest quartile scored a 61%. This is our second lowest area and one that we would like to continue to work on. Although the 2021 scores only took into account our 5th grade students for the lowest quartile, we understand that in the 2022 school year the lowest quartile grade will also include our 4th grade students.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to achieve 67% proficiency for our Math lowest quartile on FSA testing.

Monitoring: We will utilize I-Ready diagnostic and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the school year. We have identified our lowest quartile students in 4th and 5th grade and will track their progress from the first week of school. This will entail not only frequently reviewing their district and I-Ready data but also monitoring them through their IEP or MTSS action plans, as well as reviewing their progress and needs weekly during PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leigh Prokop (Improkop@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 6% 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

Ensure WIN intervention model is in place and adhered to with fidelity. This includes frequently reviewing intervention groups and making adjustments based on the data

Person Responsible Leigh Prokop (Improkop@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly review of math lowest quartile data with PLC's and administrative team in order to progress monitor the students in the math LQ.

Person Responsible Leigh Prokop (Improkop@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional development and support will be provided regrading the math curriculum and resources. Including the overlaying and bridging of the new BEST standards. Additionally, I-Ready training will be provided to help teachers access more resources and better understand student data.

Person Responsible Leigh Prokop (Improkop@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our FSA data our African American students scored a overall percentage of 28. This is well below the federal index of 41%. The largest areas of need are our ELA learning gains, ELA LQ, and science achievement with our African American students scoring 0%. This has been a continued area of concern for us with the 2019 score of 21%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to receive a overall score of 50% in ELA and Science on the FSA for our African American students.
Monitoring:	We will utilize I-Ready diagnostic and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the school year. We have identified our African American students and will examine data weekly to determine areas of intervention or opportunities for enrichment. This will entail not only frequently reviewing their district and I-Ready data but also monitoring them through their IEP or MTSS action plans, as well as reviewing their progress and needs weekly during PLC meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Moore (kamoore1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will focus on tracking the academic progress of our African American students, provide support with mentoring groups and professional training on culturally responsive teaching.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Dr. Hattie ethnicity only has an effect size of 0.32, however other factors such as teacher estimates of achievement (1.29), Collective Efficacy (1.57), integration with prior knowledge (.93), contribute to student achievement. Dr. Hattie expounds that understanding a students culture and the experience they enter the classroom with, help to build trust which is crucial to student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

We will reach out to the high school and work to develop a mentoring program focused on our African American students. Mrs. McDonald will work to develop a program where high school students could meet virtually or in person (if scheduling allows) to build positive relationships with our African American students and help provide support and guidance throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Nicole McDonald (ntmcdona@volusia.k12.fl.us)

We monitor our African American students progress through I-Ready testing and district assessments. Student will be identified and student data will be updated and tracked weekly. Additionally, student needs will be discussed weekly in PLC's.

Person Responsible Kelly Moore (kamoore1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

We will provide professional development in Culturally Responsive teaching and implement strategies in the classroom. This training will be provided to instructional staff and supported with follow-up conversations during PLC's.

Person Responsible Leigh Prokop (Improkop@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to the data found on Safe schools for Alex we have a high level for threat and intimidation and a very high level for suspensions. The concern with threat and intimidation was related to a single event. Over the 20-21 school year we implemented a school wide PBIS program and have reduced our number of suspensions. In order to continue making progress towards reducing disciplinary incidents on campus the school will implement PBIS and dig deeper into our tier 2 and 3 supports. Additionally, students will attend a SEL class through special area every other week, invite mentors on campus from both the community and high school, and conduct monthly handle with care meetings. Last, the entire faculty will be trained in Trauma Informed Care.

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.

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 started the school year with a virtual meet the teacher. This allowed 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 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.

Next we will 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 in person. Last, we work closely with business partners and other organizations to provide information and incentives to our students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Chisholm is a family school and we greatly value all of the stakeholders who contribute to making this a special place. We will work closely with business and community leaders to provide enrichment and resources. This includes back to school materials, PBIS rewards, and curriculum support such as the nutrition program. We also work closely with local colleges and universities through hosting student interns and also partnering on projects such as the UCF Shoreline Restoration Program. Communication with families is crucial to not only celebrating student successes but also working to support students and help them continue to grow. We work to communicate with families through email, conferences, phone calls, social media, and school based events. Last, we work other schools throughout the community sharing best practices, pertinent student information, resources and other information to help make all students successful.