Steinbrenner High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Steinbrenner High School

5575 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

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.

Steinbrenner High School will be among the top-performing high schools in Florida.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Steinbrenner High School will provide a rigorous course of study for students served in all programs.

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
Ewell, Tiffany	Principal	Instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and oversees all aspects of the school.
Cribb, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal of curriculum.
Garcia-Blanchard, Brandi	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal of student affairs.
Gerhardt, Ben	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal of student affairs.
Duncan, Thomas	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal of student affairs.
Southwell, Tiffany	Other	Climate and culture resource teacher.
Derflinger, Dennis	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration

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.

Stakeholders on the SAC are either employed in leadership positions, teachers, parents, or students who have volunteered to be on the School Advisory Board. They did not have opponents interested in the same positions; therefore, no voting was required to secure their SAC positions. While creating the

SIP their feedback was solicited by Tiffany Southwell and they contributed either verbally or through email.

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 and data will be disseminated and discussed at monthly SAC meetings before the beginning of the regular school day. The plan will be revised (if necessary) based on new information and/or new data points relating to the SIP plan. The bottom quartile will be closely monitored and the plan will be revised based on the data collected.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	20%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	71	51	50	68	52	51	73		
ELA Learning Gains				55			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			46		
Math Achievement*	69	42	38	62	39	38	63		
Math Learning Gains				49			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			34		
Science Achievement*	90	64	64	88	46	40	85		
Social Studies Achievement*	84	69	66	88	49	48	82		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	97	89	89	98	64	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	73	62	65	76	72	67	74		
ELP Progress	47	39	45				67		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	531
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	670
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

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	52			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	69			
HSP	71			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	65			

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	47			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	58			
HSP	65			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	57			

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)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	71			69			90	84		97	73	47
SWD	40			29			56	50		42	6	
ELL	43			44			85	67		50	7	47
AMI												
ASN	77			77			92	91		92	6	
BLK	59			47			81	88		47	6	
HSP	68			59			88	77		69	7	42
MUL	75			65			84	86		72	6	
PAC												
WHT	71			72			92	85		75	6	
FRL	57			48			78	74		53	7	50

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	68	55	40	62	49	46	88	88		98	76	
SWD	26	33	33	31	38	43	54	77		96	34	
ELL	37	47	46	54	55		65	93		96	50	
AMI												
ASN	81	62		81	60		92	100		100	88	
BLK	57	39	38	43	33		79	69		100	67	
HSP	60	51	43	51	51	51	81	88		97	73	
MUL	63	67	58	61	39		87	86		100	83	
PAC												
WHT	70	55	39	66	49	42	90	88		98	77	
FRL	53	47	35	43	45	35	77	74		95	61	

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	73	57	46	63	33	34	85	82		99	74	67
SWD	33	45	35	31	32	33	43	49		92	26	
ELL	48	45	55	39	23	30	72	43		96	59	67
AMI												
ASN	85	71		80	47		92	91		100	88	
BLK	55	32		34	24		72	53		97	59	
HSP	70	58	49	54	27	30	85	70		99	71	
MUL	64	50	44	68	33		85			91	80	
PAC												
WHT	74	57	47	66	34	37	85	87		99	75	
FRL	64	51	49	46	26	28	72	66		96	55	

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
10	2023 - Spring	69%	50%	19%	50%	19%
09	2023 - Spring	73%	48%	25%	48%	25%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	55%	-9%	50%	-4%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	49%	36%	48%	37%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	62%	28%	63%	27%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	65%	18%	63%	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.

Out of ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies, Algebra had the lowest performing achievement score.
ELA - 9th - 73, 10th - 69
Math - Algebra - 46, Geometry - 85
Science - 90
Social Studies - 84
Contributing factors to this performance included: teachers in new content area, high level of unfamiliarity with FAST, and students opting out of Algebra 1A who would benefit from the course.

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

In proficiency areas, Social Studies (U.S. History) was the only subject which demonstrated a decline. The most recent proficiency data displayed a decrease to 84% proficiency from 88% the previous year. This can be attributed to a lapse in consistent teacher attendance (leave of absence) and teachers who were teaching the curriculum for the first time.

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.

This part of the SIP plan will be revised when the state data is published.

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

Geometry learning gains showed the most improvement with a 17 point increase - 68 to 85. Our school provided tutoring opportunities for students with flexible hours as well as zoom sessions and small group instruction.

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

Areas of concern include monitoring skipping and tardies to ensure students are present for instruction.

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

Increase ELA 9th grade proficiency from 73 to 75 and 9th grade from 69 to 71.
Increase Algebra proficiency from 46 to 48 and Geometry from 85 to 87.
Ensure teachers have mastered their content and are implementing rigorous instruction and activities in the classroom.
Incorporate activities in and outside of the classroom to develop a welcoming, responsive, and safe learning environment.

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.

When students enter high school they may be inexperienced in methods for investigating and implementing opportunities to become involved in extracurricular activities. Club officers reported low numbers of freshmen members in all four types of clubs offered on campus compared to the number of sophomore, junior, and senior members. In order to promote inclusiveness and community, clubs will focus on increasing the number of freshmen members during club rush.

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

By September 30, 2023, clubs will increase the number of freshman members by 15% from 2023-2024 school year.

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

Clubs will report members categorized by grade level to the club administrator, Barbara Haight, by September 30, 2023. The CCRT, Tiffany Southwell, will contrast the freshman membership from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2023-2024 school year to determine if the gain of 15% has been achieved.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Southwell (tiffany.southwell@hcps.net)

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.)

Students in club leadership positions will encourage freshmen to attend club rush during lunches. Club leaders will assign tour guides to freshmen to help them navigate club rush based on their interests.

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

There is a relationship between inclusion, sense of community and belonging, and academic ownership. When students feel a sense of belonging and autonomy, it promotes confidence and ownership.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

In September, student club leaders and officers will visit freshman in the cafeteria during club rush and encourage the freshman to attend club rush.

Tour guides will be available to give freshmen a tour of club rush and discuss interests and review the list of clubs at the school. Tour guides will give freshmen the QR code to access the social media accounts for all school affiliated clubs, and encourage them to contact club leaders directly with questions.

Communicating with peers and becoming a part of inclusive opportunities will build the ability for student's readiness for the public postsecondary level.

Tiffany Southwell, CCRT will be responsible for monitoring the tour guides during club rush, and Brandi Garcia Blanchard will be responsible for monitoring club leaders recruiting freshmen in the cafeteria to attend club rush.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Southwell (tiffany.southwell@hcps.net)

By When: September 30, 2023.

QR codes created for club rush. (August 2023)
Tour guides selected and trained. (August 2023)
Data comparison (October 2023)
Monitoring freshman data throughout the year for club attendance - quarterly until the end of the year.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Southwell (tiffany.southwell@hcps.net)

By When: September 30, 2023

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

After reviewing proficiency data and setting proficiency increase goals, in order to acheve these goals it is necessary to ensure teachers are meeting consistently across subject areas to review instructional methods and progress monitoring data. Professional Learning Communities will formally meet at least once a month and discuss use of common assessments, progress monitoring data, fidelity checks for addressing standards within lesson plans, and pacing guidelines.

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

By the 2023-2024 standardized testing window for each subject, Professional Learning Communities will work together towards increasing proficiency in Math, ELA, and Science by two percentage points, and in U.S. History, by four percentage points.

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

Professional Learning Communities are observed by the leadership team to ensure all areas of focus for the meetings are addressed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Cribb (daniel.cribb@hcps.net)

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.)

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

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.

Monthly formal meetings are set for the academic year for each Professional Learning Community. Department heads convey expectations for each meeting. (September 2023)
Leadership team monitors Professional Learning Community meetings to ensure all areas of focus are addressed and aligned to the performance goal. (Monthly throughout the academic year)

Person Responsible: Tiffany Southwell (tiffany.southwell@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly - Professional Learning Communities will be held and observed by the leadership team. Final testing window for each subject (spring 2024) PLC's should have guided instruction for proficiency increases.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

Although our Science, ELA, and Math proficiency scores increased from the prior year, our U.S. History scores decreased 4 percentage points. The area of focus associated with this data is to ensure U.S. History teachers have mastered their content and are delivering rigorous instruction and using differentiation to ensure students at all performance levels are increasing their content knowledge.

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

Measured through leadership and peer-to-peer observations and reflection sessions, U.S. History teachers will implement differentiated instruction in classrooms. The U.S. History department aims to increase proficiency scores to our prior year's proficiency of 88.

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

Beginning in the first quarter of 2023, the school leadership team will observe U.S. History teachers to monitor how differentiated instruction is used in the classroom. Peer-to-peer observation will occur bi-weekly to model differentiated instruction. To monitor this area of focus, leaders and peers will record how teachers are using differentiation strategies. Based on these observations, teachers will be asked to attend and/or lead professional development focused on differentiated instruction in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Cribb (daniel.cribb@hcps.net)

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.)

Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read and routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text.

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

Students who struggle with reading comprehension can benefit from small group or individual instruction with a structured approach to reading using the interventions above. These interventions help students comprehending reading through chunking to decode unfamiliar words in context and uncover meaning in a literary work.
Progress monitoring gives teachers the ability to identify students who are in need of further instruction.

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.

Implement differentiated instruction strategies within the first 45 days of school.
Implement progress monitoring for baseline data during first 30 days of school.
Leadership team creates observation schedule. (August 2023)
Progress monitoring data shared with leadership team. (Quarterly)

Person Responsible: Tiffany Ewell (tiffany.ewell@hcps.net)

By When: Beginning August 18, 2023 and continuous throughout the academic year.