Chisholm Elementary School

2022-23 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: 6/1/2020

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (58%)
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	ATSI
* 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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	84%

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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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.

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moore, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal. Works to support the principal 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.
Rankin, Angela	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.
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.
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.
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.
Dill, Nikki	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
Baird, Christine	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.
Daughtry, Ashley	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.
Moulton, Erin	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/1/2020, Melissa Marple

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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
42

Total number of students enrolled at the school
493

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	68	82	70	81	89	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	16	13	14	18	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	4	1	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	14	8	9	11	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	5	4	4	13	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	53%	56%				57%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						51%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						24%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	73%	42%	50%				64%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						51%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						41%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	55%	59%				76%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	59%	-8%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	75%	56%	19%	53%	22%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	28	44	41	39	43	32	36				
BLK	30	47		27	61	45					
MUL	65	64		65	64						
WHT	73	70	46	80	78	55	78				
FRL	58	62	47	63	71	48	59				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
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	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

A school-wide decrease was noted in district ELA assessments on the new Best standards. Proficiency for students with disabilities decreased from 47% to 37% on the FSA. African American students increased in their overall proficiency in ELA, math, and science on the FSA.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

3rd grade ELA proficiency decreased from 68% to 53%. Proficiency for students with disabilities decreased from 47% to 37%. Proficiency for African American students increased from 29% to 39%. However, this is still below the federal index of 41%. In ELA, our lowest quartile gains decreased from 56% to 47%. In math, our lowest quartile gains decreased from 61% to 49%.

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

New benchmarks curriculum resulted in a learning year for teachers to adjust to the new materials. The 3rd grade math teacher was a new teacher in the 2022-2023 school year. The 3rd grade ELA teacher was new to teaching the grade level. Our school walk to intervention model for reading intervention had larger groups due to no intervention teacher and no academic coach.

Teachers will continue to have professional learning opportunities to support knowledge and implementation of ELA benchmarks and new math standards. An academic coach and intervention teacher will push in support this year during reading intervention. Support facilitators are now providing services during the reading WIN block, which results in students with disabilities not missing core instructional time during the 90 minutes reading block.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Overall ELA achievement increased by 3%, from 64% to 67%. Our learning gains increased form 64% to 66%. In math our gains increased from 69% to 74%. In science our achievement increased from 70% to 72%.

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

A 30 minute walk to intervention block was implemented 5 days a week. Ready reading was implemented for grades 3, 4, and 5. Reading gains can be attributed to 4th and 5th grade classes being departmentalized. Each 4th and 5th grade classroom teacher is experienced in teaching their grade level content. Science achievement can be attributed to working with the district specialist in a one on one capacity with the 5th grade science teacher. The 5th grade science teacher utilized science assessment data to reteach standards that weren't mastered.

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

A 30 minute walk to intervention in ELA including the classroom teachers, an intervention teacher, academic coach, and support facilitation in order to meet the needs of each individual student. In math we will continue with an intervention block. Teachers will focus on learning and implementing the new math BEST standards. The Magnetics Reading resource will be purchased and implemented during the ELA walk to intervention block in grades 3 through 5.

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.

In order to support the learning of students with disabilities teachers will engage in professional learning on best practices for inclusion teaching practices, instructional differentiation, and increasing instructional intensity. These professional learning opportunities will also support instructional practices for all students. A trainer from curriculum associates will be invited to provide training to teachers on disaggregating iready reading and math diagnostic 1 data and planning for instructional grouping, strategies, and lessons to meet students' needs.

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

Additional support will also be provided by the district ELA, math, and science resource teachers. Resource teachers will be invited to participate in learning walks, as well as provide support through grade level PLCs. Additionally, the ESE program specialist, elementary assistant superintendent, and elementary director will also be invited to participate in learning walks in order to provide feedback to improve teaching practices.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our area of focus is aligned to the district strategic plan goal 1; engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis, it revealed that only 37% of students with disabilities and 39% of African American students scored at the achievement level in ELA, math and science.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will increase the overall proficiency of students with disabilities from 37% to 50%. The overall proficiency of African American students from 39% to 50%. The teachers will increase their usage of cooperative structures that are standards aligned and differentiated.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will utilize the results of the FAST progress monitoring assessments and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the school year. We have identified our African American students and students with disabilities. We will examine data as new data is acquired to determine areas of intervention or opportunities for enrichment. This will entail not only frequently reviewing district and i-Ready data but also monitoring them through their IEP or MTSS action plans, as well as reviewing progress and needs weekly during PLC meetings. Teachers will be provided with professional learning focused on student centered cooperative structures. This will be monitored through learning walks and classroom visits.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Moore (kamoore1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports. K-2 will implement SIPPS which is a systematic foundational skills program. It will be monitored through fidelity checks during intervention time and through monitoring of Mastery test data. 3-5 will utilize intervention kits through Benchmark Advance and Big Ideas. As part of MTSS specialized programs will be utilized for students with disabilities such as, Corrective Reading, Connecting Math Concepts, Heggerty, and Early Intervention in Reading. Teachers will be trained in Kagan Cooperative Learning with a focus on differentiation throughout their instruction blocks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the**	MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. The power of a tiered system of supports rests in the fact that it is based on prevention. MTSS is not a "wait to fail" model for students who are in need of additional supports. The potential benefits of a Multi-Tiered System

rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

of Supports were outlined in John Hattie's work and can yield an effect size of 1.29, when implemented with fidelity. Faculty and staff will be provided with essential training in MTSS and its strategies to support student learning.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

In PLCs teachers will meet to review students in intervention from the previous year and set up intervention groups based on those students. Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Determine how to meet the needs of these students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on the Decision Trees and ICEL (Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner) strategy.

Person Responsible   Erin Moulton (esmoulto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional learning through ERPLS on MTSS systems and structures.
Training in Kagan Cooperative Structures will be implemented to ensure alignment of district resources.

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

Implementation of professional learning of MTSS strategies following the district ERPLS.
Decision Tree guidance and ICEL strategy; Tier 1 - 100% of students should receive Tier 1 and at least 80% of students should be meeting proficiency to indicate good quality core instruction. Tier 2 - 15% of students receive targeted level of prevention; Tier 3 - 3-5% of students receive intensive level of prevention; all students receive these supports in a stacked manner including students with disabilities.

Person Responsible   Erin Moulton (esmoulto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Once a month at the PLC meetings we will meet to discuss the progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroups, making progress towards 70% proficiency on unit/chapter assessments in ELA, math, and science.
Bi-weekly checkpoints of targeted students - make adjustments to the intervention, as needed, through data analysis, while considering ICEL.
Monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions of lowest quartile students through walkthroughs.
Students that continue to need further supports/intervention would be identified in order to move them to Tier 3.

Person Responsible   Erin Moulton (esmoulto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students in kindergarten through grade 5 had an overall proficiency rate of 55.2% in ELA. Students in kindergarten through grade 5 had an overall proficiency rate of 78.2% in math. Students in kindergarten through grade 5 had an overall proficiency of 73.3% in science.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will increase ELA proficiency from 55.2% to 70% on district assessments. We will increase math proficiency from 78.2% on district assessments to 80%. We will increase science proficiency from 73.3% to 78% on district assessments. The teachers will increase their usage of cooperative structures that are standards aligned and differentiated.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will utilize state progress monitoring assessments and district assessments to monitor student progress throughout the school year. We will also utilize frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific standards aligned look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Teachers will be provided with professional learning focused on student centered cooperative structures. This will be monitored through learning walks and classroom visits.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Marple (mamarple@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	We will be focusing on core instruction of the Best standards. 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 Magnetics 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

implemented for this Area of Focus.	instruction and adapt the intervention and small group teams to best meet student needs. Resources will be used from Benchmark Advance for ELA, Big Ideas for math, and the iReady teacher toolbox. Teachers will be trained in Kagan Cooperative Learning with a focus on differentiation throughout their instruction blocks. Differentiated instruction through the intervention WIN block will take place daily to support the individual learning needs of each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	WIN Time: Building in differentiated 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 indicates that interventions for students with learning needs has an effect size of .72. Professional development: Teachers and support staff will have a greater understanding of the new math standards and curriculum 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional development and support will be provided regarding the new math curriculum and resources. Training on the Best Standards will be provided. In addition, training in Kagan Cooperative Structures will be implemented to ensure alignment of district resources.

Person Responsible   Erin Moulton (esmoulto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Planning time will be provided for teams to meet as professional learning communities to develop lesson plans for core instruction, intervention, and enrichment in both Reading and Math.

Person Responsible   Erin Moulton (esmoulto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Learning walks will be conducted to gather data on instructional practices (cooperative structures), standards aligned instruction, and utilization of curriculum resources in Math and ELA .

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

District Math and Reading data will be analyzed monthly through grade level PLCs to determine the effectiveness of the instructional practice of the teachers. The data will determine the PLC focus for the following week (collaborative structures, utilization of the curriculum resources with fidelity, elementary curriculum specialist support).

Person Responsible   Erin Moulton (esmoulto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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. We started the school year with a Meet the Teacher event. This allowed parents to meet their student's teacher(s) and ask questions about the upcoming school year and policies and procedures. We will host an Open House in the fall for teachers to share curriculum and school information with students and families. 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. We will also host other events include a math night, science night, and reading night. In addition we will host a Storybook Parade, bingo night, a school dance, and the Lady Cats show will also occur. Mentors and volunteers have always had a tremendous impact on our students, faculty, and staff. 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 school culture and environment.

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. We will be working with the Audubon Center for Birds of Prey to establish a school garden. 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.