

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Clark Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Clark Elementary School

19002 WOOD SAGE DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[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.

Clark Elementary School will provide an educational atmosphere where all students are able to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clark Elementary School will provide all students the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

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
Rabeiro, Delilah	Principal	Oversee day to day operations of the school. The principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary, adult, ESE or other specialized public-school sites. The principal serves as an instructional leader and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national and school board standards.
Wackes, Kelly	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will assist with the instructional, administrative and operational leadership of the school.
Addison, Aimee	School Counselor	The Counselor is responsible for coordinating and implementing the school's counseling services program to include academic advisement and counseling, developmental guidance, career development, and parent/ community involvement.
Shuaibi-Albustami, Sonia	Psychologist	The School Psychologist will coordinate and implement psychological services, which include academic and behavioral consultation emphasizing the problem-solving model, psychoeducational assessment, individual/group counseling, and crisis intervention. The School Psychologist will work collaboratively with administrators, teachers, other school personnel, parents, and various community agencies to support the educational needs of students.
Schieler, Debra	Other	The Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Specialist will provide site-based support in all areas of exceptional student education. This position will utilize program knowledge and leadership skills to work collaboratively with school, region, and district staff to provide supports for curriculum, instruction, behavior, compliance, and programmatic decisions. The ESE Specialist will assist the administrative team, ESE and general education teachers, school staff, parents, and students to ensure the provision of a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) and to improve the outcomes of students with disabilities.
Clark, Donna	ELL Compliance Specialist	The English Language Learners (ELL) Specialist will provide leadership in the facilitation, development, implementation and evaluation of the district's instructional programs for English Language Learners (ELL). The ELL Specialist will support faculty, staff and students in meeting academic standards.
Kelly, Jennifer	SAC Member	Communicate SAC related information to all SAC Members, plan and host meetings to discuss SAC business,

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.

Members of the leadership team reviewed school data and discussed trends. Based on the review, goals were created and aligned with the district's goal.

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))

SIP plan will be reviewed every quarter, and the plan will be revised as needed.

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	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
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	

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	0	35	35	17	22	29	0	0	0	138	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	30	18	0	0	0	0	48	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	17	9	0	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	16	14	0	0	0	62	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	10	7	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	21	24	27	32	16	14	0	0	0	134	

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	2	1	4	5	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	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	36	27	18	12	21	10	0	0	0	124	
One or more suspensions	4	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	8	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	6	9	0	0	0	16	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	29	37	27	18	19	0	0	0	150	

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	0	3	7	8	0	0	0	18

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	2	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	36	27	18	12	21	10	0	0	0	124	
One or more suspensions	4	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	8	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	6	9	0	0	0	16	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	29	37	27	18	19	0	0	0	150	

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	0	3	7	8	0	0	0	18

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	2	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*	74	50	53	78	53	56	76		
ELA Learning Gains				73			76		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			56		
Math Achievement*	84	56	59	89	50	50	81		
Math Learning Gains				84			85		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			69		
Science Achievement*	73	50	54	82	59	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	59	59	77			68		

* 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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	61			
HSP	64			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	80			

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%
FRL	57			

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	53			
ELL	76			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	72			
HSP	72			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	67			

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	74			84			73					69
SWD	39			49			14				4	
ELL	68			83			62				5	69
AMI												
ASN	89			97			77				5	86
BLK	61			78			52				4	
HSP	63			70			67				5	62
MUL	61			83							3	

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
PAC												
WHT	81			85			88				4	
FRL	54			70			59				5	63

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	78	73	55	89	84	73	82					77
SWD	40	53	42	60	69	65	44					
ELL	82	71	62	96	89		57					77
AMI												
ASN	90	85		95	96		93					86
BLK	67	62	50	88	78	80	81					
HSP	69	73	65	86	81	62	67					69
MUL	64	58		86	75							
PAC												
WHT	83	72	50	89	82	64	82					
FRL	61	66	56	84	74	72	62					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	76	76	56	81	85	69	73					68
SWD	37	33		44	43		33					
ELL	77	79		84	89		77					68
AMI												
ASN	91	83		94	93		91					73
BLK	62	83		59	67	60	54					
HSP	68	81		77	87		65					63
MUL	76			88								
PAC												
WHT	76	63		87	89		75					69
FRL	66	82	67	69	76	63	61					63

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	78%	53%	25%	54%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	54%	19%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	46%	19%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	79%	55%	24%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	53%	35%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	72%	47%	25%	51%	21%

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.

ELA Proficiency was the lowest at 71% proficiency. It was a drop of 7% points from the prior year. Core instruction and differentiation during small group instruction is our priority for this year.

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

ELA Proficiency dropped from 78% to 71%

Science Proficiency dropped from 82% to 72%

Core Instruction is our priority for this year with differentiation during small group instruction.

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.

Information is not available at this time.

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

Our overall total was 75% which is a 1% difference from the prior year. We will continue to focus on Purposeful PLCs. to plan strong core instruction and small group with differentiation.

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

Attendance
and ELA Proficiency

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

PLCs
Core Instruction Planning
DI lessons for small group
Increasing attendance rates

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 Early Warning System

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.

Increasing student attendance is an area of focus as identified by the EWS. Research supports students need to be present and on time for optimal learning outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase attendance rate 90% or higher for our students.

Monitoring:

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

In addition to the principal and assistant principal the plan will be monitored by the school social worker and student service team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@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.)

School-wide incentive Plan implemented this school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is best practice to have a school-wide incentive plan where expectations are clear.

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.

School wide Cougar Pride Plan Action Steps:

Form a committee to create and execute a positive school culture and environment plan. The committee will be comprised of school staff per administration.

Create a plan prior to the start of the school year that will continuously monitor and reward a positive school culture through the use of "Cougar Dens", a point system and monthly pep rallies to encourage participation and excitement for doing good, treating others with respect, and making choices with integrity.

The committee will plan and implement rewarding opportunities and events to encourage continuous participation by all. Quarterly meetings will be held to debrief and make any necessary changes to continue positive growth.

Person Responsible: Kelly Wackes (kelly.wackes@hcps.net)

By When: Committee will be created by the start of the school year. Quarterly meetings will be used to monitor and adjust as needed.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**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.

This year our focus is on core instruction. There was a slight decline in ELA & science proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, ELA proficiency will increase to 78% and Science Proficiency will increase to 82% as a result of targeted core instruction monitored through bi-weekly PLCs, monthly team leader meetings, and quarterly data reviews.

Monitoring:

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

PLCs
Lesson plans
PM1,2 & 3
Class Assessments
Data Chats
Instructional Reviews

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@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.)

PLCs
Progress Monitoring
Feedback
ELA & Science Collaborative Planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Best practice shows these evidence-based interventions build capacity amongst our teacher and build strong collaborative team that analyze data to plan instruction that impact student learning and outcomes.

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.

PLC PD Training will be provided for teachers at the school site to set the expectations and understanding of productive PLC structures. This step will be conducted and monitored by Delilah Rabeiro and Kelly Wackes.

Monthly Meetings with Team Leaders will be conducted and monitored by Delilah Rabeiro, Kelly Wackes,

and Team Leaders. This step will be used to assist in monitoring, communicating and determining effective strategies and next steps in school-wide, targeted core instruction and collaborative planning. Quarterly Data and Instructional Reviews will be implemented to continuously monitor learning growth and provide conversation and feedback in regard to specific, targeted core instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Kelly Wackes (kelly.wackes@hcps.net)

By When: Quarterly