

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Carrollwood K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Carrollwood K 8 School

3516 MCFARLAND RD, Tampa, FL 33618

[ 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.**

Carrollwood Elementary School will be a leader in developing high performing students who are prepared for life.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Carrollwood Elementary School will prepare students for life.

### 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
Stover, Mary Jo	Principal	Maintain the campus and the instructional responsibilities of students and staff.
Calve, Christina	Assistant Principal	

**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.

During pre-planning data is reviewed and disaggregated, teachers work with their team to come up with goals and look-fors.

**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 plan will be monitored during SAC meetings with stakeholders, leadership team will review it monthly and grade levels through their PLC meetings.

### Demographic Data

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	59%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	76%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	3	14	6	6	8	8	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	11	15	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	9	23	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	0	30	16	25	14	16	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	22	8	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	23	13	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	12	13	11	13	16	4	0	0	0	69

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	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	30	16	25	14	16	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	22	8	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	23	13	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	12	13	11	13	16	4	0	0	0	69

**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	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	8
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*	64	51	53	69	51	55	66		
ELA Learning Gains				67			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			50		
Math Achievement*	66	50	55	69	41	42	62		
Math Learning Gains				71			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			36		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	54	48	52	51	48	54	63		
Social Studies Achievement*		65	68		57	59			
Middle School Acceleration		70	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	81	52	55	68	73	70	74		

\* 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	50			
HSP	54			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	51			

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	47			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	61			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	73			
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)

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	64			66			54					81
SWD	28			28			37				4	
ELL	28			41			17				4	81
AMI												
ASN	73			82							2	
BLK	55			45							2	
HSP	52			60			41				5	80
MUL	74			63							3	
PAC												
WHT	73			73			66				4	
FRL	48			52			33				5	73

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	69	67	58	69	71	67	51					68
SWD	37	53	67	43	59	52	21					
ELL	53	59	59	52	67	69	30					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	53		38	46							
HSP	63	61	46	62	67	65	55					65
MUL	62			54								
PAC												
WHT	81	73	73	81	76	64	62					
FRL	57	64	56	60	61	61	38					60

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	66	65	50	62	60	36	63					74
SWD	40	52	54	35	50	43	40					
ELL	42	50	50	36	43		18					74

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			52								
HSP	60	66	53	52	59	50	54					72
MUL	50			57								
PAC												
WHT	76	67		74	61		67					
FRL	50	56	42	46	46	35	52					71

**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	63%	53%	10%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	54%	22%	58%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	46%	6%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	59%	19%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	53%	7%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	51%	0%

### 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.**

Third grade ELA proficiency scores show lower than previous years. Factors contributing to this was the new state assessment, test going from paper-pencil to computerized, new reading resource materials.

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

Third grade ELA proficiency went from 69% in 2022 to 56% in 2023. This group of students were affected by covid in kindergarten, and when in first grade a lot of them were doing virtual schooling.

**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.**

Our school ranked with or higher than the state average in all content areas on the state assessments. However, our school will continue to focus on science as we scored at state level.

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

Overall, the math proficiency in fourth grade was at 81%. Our school provided ELP services to student's tier 3 students. Our school's talent developers provided small group instruction to tier 2 students.

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

3rd grade students scoring at or below a level 2 in reading.

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

Our school's highest priority is to decrease the number of students below proficiency in reading school wide. In addition, we will focus on increasing the number of students scoring at or above a 3 on science FSSA.

#### Area of Focus

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

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

### 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 will increase student science proficiency (3 or higher) from 51% to 63% by aligning the instruction and instructional tasks to the rigor of the standards with continuous progress monitoring.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is that Carrollwood will increase its science proficiency to 63% on the 2023-2024 FSSA.

### Monitoring:

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

- Progress monitoring using district assessments.
- Science coaching and observation cycles with district science coach and team planning
- Evidence of science vocabulary instruction and application
- Evidence of Nature of Science instruction - tools, scientific method, etc.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Calve (christina.calve@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.)

Vertical PLCs to identify trends and connections between standards among grade levels.  
Coaching cycles with Science DRT  
Performing walk-throughs with science " observation checklist and look-fors".

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By ensuring engaging, rigorous, consistent science instruction in all grade levels, we will support regular data meetings following each common assessment will help instructional staff identify students' level of standard mastery. That information will be used to effectively differentiate through foundational scaffolding, additional guided practice, or providing opportunities for application/analysis/evaluation/creation.

### 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.

Common Planning  
Vertical PLCs  
Teacher Observation and Science lessons (science DRT)

Use of science tools  
Inquiry Monday  
STEM time  
Longterm Investigations  
Peer Walk Throughs  
Vocabulary Training

**Person Responsible:** Christina Calve (christina.calve@hcps.net)

**By When:** On or before estimated Science FSSA.



## #2. 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.

Our focus is to create a conducive learning environment, so that scores will increase. This is an area of focus due to the Spring Panorama survey, where only 45% of students felt respected by others. This was a decline of 11% from the Fall Panorama survey.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By the spring 2024 survey 60% of students k-6 will feel respected by others. This will be monitored by Panorama Survey.

### Monitoring:

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

It will be monitored through the fall and spring implementation of the Panorama survey.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Jo Stover (maryjo.stover@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.)

Teachers will implement Frameworks strategies. In addition, Student Services will conduct classroom lessons focused on respect.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our school has seen a great increase in positive culture using Frameworks in the past. Students will benefit receiving explicit instruction focused on respect.

### 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.

Guidance counselor mindful moments on morning show.

Teachers will provide Hootie Bucks for positive reinforcement.

Character Education lessons

Monthly Awards

Caught being good messages to students.

**Person Responsible:** Mary Jo Stover (maryjo.stover@hcps.net)

**By When:** May of 2024

### **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).

N/A