Chisholm Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Chisholm Elementary School

557 RONNOC LN, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/chisholm/pages/default.aspx

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

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.
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.
Goodknecht, Cynthia	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Ciaramella, Tammy	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.
Moulton, Erin	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach who supports teachers through coaching based on instructional need and data analysis. The coach facilitates professional learning and Professional Learning Communities with each grade level. In addition, he is a liaison between administration and teachers sharing concerns and assisting with meeting our SIP, school policies, procedures and school focus areas. She also monitors the progress of the SIP.
Dill, Nikki	Teacher, ESE	SE 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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The initial development of the SIP is completed by the school leadership team. Once we have analyzed the data, we present the data, barriers, focus areas, and strategies to the instructional staff. We have them collaborate to narrow down the proposed strategies to determine the best plan of action to meet the needs of the school. At a following SAC meeting, we present the information to the council for their input.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored monthly by our School Leadership Team to determine if the plan and implementation of strategies is working to achieve the desired outcomes. In addition, weekly PLC meetings will focus on students who are not making growth and the development of instructional strategies will take place to ensure each student is making progress. If we find a SIP strategy is not working, we will work with the leadership team to determine a better solution and make adjustments to the plan. This could include professional learning, new resources, instructional coaching, tutoring, etc.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	84%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	1	13	17	17	14	10	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	3	5	5	1	3	0	0	0	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	9	24	6	16	0	0	0	59

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	12	5	7	0	0	0	29

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	16	13	14	18	15	16	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	4	1	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	12	11	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	10	13	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	8	9	11	9	9	0	0	0	60

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	4	4	13	14	4	0	0	0	44

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	16	13	14	18	15	16	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	4	1	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	12	11	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	10	13	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	8	9	11	9	9	0	0	0	60

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	4	4	13	14	4	0	0	0	44

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	52	53	67	53	56	64		
ELA Learning Gains				66			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			56		
Math Achievement*	60	55	59	73	42	50	73		
Math Learning Gains				74			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			61		
Science Achievement*	74	62	54	72	55	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	263
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	25	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	1	1
HSP	50			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			60			74					
SWD	25			27			26				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	14			18			50				3	
HSP	40			60							2	
MUL	47			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	70			69			81				4	
FRL	44			45			60				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	66	47	73	74	49	72					
SWD	28	44	41	39	43	32	36					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	30	47		27	61	45						
HSP												
MUL	65	64		65	64							
PAC												
WHT	73	70	46	80	78	55	78					
FRL	58	62	47	63	71	48	59					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	63	56	73	69	61	70					
SWD	26	58		40	64		36					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			44								
HSP												
MUL	52			57								
PAC												
WHT	70	66	62	78	69	75	75					
FRL	52	50	46	66	65	50	65					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	57%	0%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	51%	20%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

According to PM3 third grade math is the lowest performing component.

Contributing Factors: There was a novice teacher in the grade level in her second year teaching. Additionally, there was new math curriculum in place and limited use of the B1G M.

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

Math overall was the greatest decline from the prior year. We declined 9% overall. The largest decline was in 5th.

Contributing Factors: Our 5th grade teacher took a position in another county. This resulted in a vacancy with a sub providing instruction. A novice teacher was hired to fill the position.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap when compared to the state was 3rd grade math with Chisholm scoring 57% and the state scoring 55%.

Contributing Factors: There was a novice teacher in the grade level in her second year teaching. Additionally, there was new math curriculum in place and limited use of the B1G M.

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

Science demonstrated the most improvement.

New Actions/Contributing Factors: An experienced science teacher was hired to provide science instruction for 5th grade.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

There were 72 students that had attendance below 90%. 59 Students were identified as having a substantial reading deficiency.

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

*Math instruction aligned to the benchmark - planning
*ESSA Subgroup
*ELA instruction aligned to the benchmark

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Chisholm Elementary implemented PBIS in the 2020-2021 school year as a measure to improve student behavior and reduce disciplinary concerns. During the 2022-2023 school year Chisholm Elementary had 294 referrals written and processed. This was an increase of 53 referrals from the previous school year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will decrease the number of referrals written by 20% from 294 to 235. The number of positive referrals that are written will also be monitored. The number of students attending the quarterly PBIS incentive, the Chissy Buck Bonanza, will also be monitored.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student Practice
By February 2024 our student referral count will be 20% less than the February 2023 count.

Teacher Practice
By February 2024 teachers will implement PBIS with fidelity within their classrooms and the school environment. This will be evidenced by student participation in the Chissy Buck Bonanza and classes moving through the PAW Points cafeteria tracker.

Administration Practice
The number of referrals that are written throughout the school year will be monitored monthly at the PBIS team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS is an evidence based practice that is well documented as a strategy to improve student behavior. The Tough Kids Toolbox is utilized frequently to determine supportive strategies for students that are demonstrating challenging behaviors. Additionally within the PBIS program we are implementing our Wildcat 200 Club. This has been adapted from the Principal's 200 club and is described in the Tough Kid Principal's briefcase book.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS was originally implemented at Chisholm Elementary in the 2020-2021 school year. This school-wide program creates cohesiveness throughout all classrooms and areas of campus with clear expectations. PBIS is meant to reinforce positive behavior frequently and consistently in order to reduce negative behavior.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

A review of the PBIS program will be provided to all staff during pre-planning. This includes a review of Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 PBIS interventions. Teachers will review the PBIS program with students within the first week of school. New faculty and staff members will be onboarded with the PBIS program as the year progresses.

Person Responsible: Angela Rankin (atrankin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

The school counselor will conduct outreach to the community to improve participation in our school-wide mentor program.

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

By When: October 2023

The Wildcat 200 Club will continue to be implemented this school year. Students that receive positive referrals will place their name on a number within the 200 club. Once the 10 spaces are filled with student names, they will receive a reward.

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

By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have seen a 9% decline in our overall 3rd through 5th grade math assessment data. In ELA our data has remained unchanged at 64% proficiency for two years in a row. There is inconsistencies with using the B1G M to plan for math instruction and utilizing this resource to align with the curriculum. Additionally, there is inconsistencies with using the item test specifications when planning instruction.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Student Practice:
By February 2024 our overall 3rd through 5th grade math FAST PM2 proficiency will be 42%. By February 2024 our overall 3rd through 5th grade ELA FAST PM2 proficiency will be 55%.
Teacher Practice:
By April 2024, 95% of teachers will provide students standards-aligned instruction and tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.
Coaching Practice:
By April 2024, 70% of tier 2 and tier 3 teachers will provide students with benchmark aligned instruction and tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student Practice:
Student data will be disaggregated after PM1 and PM2 and compared to state and county proficiency and growth trends.
After each benchmark-aligned common assessment is administered, teachers, with the support of the academic coach will analyze the data to measure student progress over time.
Teacher Practice:
The four focus area walkthrough tool will be utilized to collect trend data. The four focus areas include benchmark aligned instruction, benchmark aligned tasks, questions that deepen understanding of intended learning, and opportunities for student collaborative structures.
Administration and coaches will attend all PLCs.
Coaching Practice:
Administration and the academic coach will meet weekly to review classroom trend data and adjust as needed. The academic coach will be present in planning to support the development of explicit and intentional instruction that is aligned. The academic coach will also help plan and model benchmark aligned instruction through collaborative structures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will be focusing on core instruction. This instruction will take place during the math and 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, ESE support facilitation teachers. The school will utilize vetted resources to support small group instruction. 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. Resources will be used from Benchmark Advance for ELA, Big Ideas for math, and the iReady teacher toolbox. SIPPS will be used in K-2 to provide systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics and sight words. FAST indicates a need for strong, systemic foundational skills intervention in K-2. 3-5 will use Magnetic for explicit instruction in comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Learning walks will be conducted to gather data on explicit benchmark aligned instruction, tasks aligned to the benchmark, questioning to deepen understanding, and collaborative structures in Math and ELA .

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

By When: This will be monitored weekly as an administrative team.

In PLCs teachers will meet to review students in intervention from the previous year and set up intervention groups based on those students. Students within the identified ESSA subgroups (SWD and black) will also be identified in order to plan for the intervention needs of these students. Teachers will plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Teachers will 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)

By When: This will be reviewed monthly through PLCs.

We will be focusing on benchmark aligned instruction through the use of collaborative structures. Teachers will be trained in collaborative structures. Learning with a focus on differentiation throughout their instruction blocks.

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

By When: October 2023

Professional development and support will be provided regarding the math and ELA curriculum and resources.

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

By When: October 2023

District Math and Reading data will be analyzed following each scheduled Volusia Benchmark Assessment (VBA) 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: [no one identified]

By When: Following each VBA.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Funding allocations are reviewed by the school's budget committee prior to the start of the school year. The team identifies how district funds will be allocated within the school. The team votes on the plan which is then implemented. SAC funding is discussed during each SAC meeting. Funds requests are presented to the committee to meet the needs of the students as identified in the school improvement plan. During the meeting, members have the opportunity to ask questions. The following month, the committee comes together and votes on whether or not to allocate funds for the requested purpose.
School raised funds are also used to support the needs of the school. We purchase both math and reading resources to support students and teacher instruction for intervention. The school leadership team collaborates to determine the best resources to meet the needs of both students and teachers.
All resources are purchased to support the highest needs of the school. This includes instruction in reading, math, and science for our lowest performers.