Robinson High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Robinson High School

6311 S LOIS AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[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.

We will provide a positive, healthy, and safe environment while promoting high expectations and providing diverse cultural experiences and valuable educational opportunities for the Robinson High School family.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Robinson High School multicultural family is committed to preparing students to meet the challenges of the future by encouraging lifelong learning, international and intercultural awareness, work and professional skills, and "Pride Through Excellence".

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
Brown, David	Principal	Mr. Brown oversees and is responsible for daily operations of the school, financial operations, personnel, public relations, school policy regarding discipline, coordination of the instructional programs, and other overall school matters. He plays an essential role promoting the school mission and vison to all stakeholders and creating a safe environment for students to excel.
Pettit, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Curriculum
Morman, Kailyn	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Administration
Morgan, Lora	SAC Member	Serves as our Culture and Clime Resource Teacher and School Advisory Committee chair.

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.

School leadership team which included admin, leaders of parent organizations such as PTSA, teachers, and staff reviewed 22-23 data including school test scores compared to state test scores, and EWS to include attendance and behavior to determine areas of concern as well as areas of success.

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))

During each monthly SAC meeting, the SAC committee will give progress monitoring updates as it relates to data and goals set forth in the SIP. During weekly PSLT meetings, EWS for students will

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	53%
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: B 2018-19: B 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	
	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	310
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
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	90

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	66	51	50	65	52	51	65		
ELA Learning Gains				57			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			29		
Math Achievement*	44	42	38	51	39	38	43		
Math Learning Gains				31			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			32		
Science Achievement*	80	64	64	82	46	40	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	92	69	66	92	49	48	84		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	87	89	89	91	64	61	89		
College and Career Acceleration	68	62	65	62	72	67	64		
ELP Progress	31	39	45	29			44		

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	87

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	644
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	91

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	42			
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	56			
HSP	68			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	53			

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	44			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	48			
HSP	60			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	51			

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	66			44			80	92		87	68	31
SWD	35			23			55	61		23	6	
ELL	35			17			60	69		25	7	31
AMI												
ASN	80			63			91	92		85	6	
BLK	41			24			54	94		50	6	
HSP	66			42			78	89		53	6	
MUL	60			46			83	83		79	6	
PAC												
WHT	71			52			84	95		70	6	
FRL	46			29			66	86		48	7	27

| 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	65	57	44	51	31	40	82	92		91	62	29
SWD	28	49	33	16	14		69	77		86	24	
ELL	32	54	56	41	58		64	81		94	47	29
AMI												
ASN	77	67		77			86	97		96	78	
BLK	40	40	47	21	32	43	54	79		92	30	
HSP	60	56	48	40	25		85	90		91	54	50
MUL	58	44	15	67	42		76	90		86	60	
PAC												
WHT	72	61	45	60	32	50	87	96		90	73	
FRL	46	47	38	36	33	44	70	83		84	42	40

| 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	65	50	29	43	27	32	67	84		89	64	44
SWD	18	29	24	24	26	25	20	59		79	29	
ELL	17	30	24	15	19	10	29			84	24	44
AMI												
ASN	83	57		63	46		83	96		100	92	
BLK	35	34	35	18	26	32	37	69		81	45	
HSP	60	50	19	37	20	25	63	67		86	53	43
MUL	68	57		24	21		67	87		92	64	
PAC												
WHT	71	51	32	60	29	36	73	89		89	68	
FRL	48	42	26	26	22	24	53	67		78	51	45

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	64%	50%	14%	50%	14%
09	2023 - Spring	65%	48%	17%	48%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	50%	-6%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	49%	1%	48%	2%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	62%	18%	63%	17%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	65%	25%	63%	27%

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.

Alg 1 scores were the lowest with a 49%. Schedules were adjusted to better place students in A and B courses.

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

Geometry showed the greatest decline from the year before going from 62% to 49%. Factors that contributed to this decline could be the track that students were on for example going from Alg 1 to GEO versus Algebra A/B to Geometry.

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.

Alg 1 state average was 54% and RHS was at 43%. Trend is that we are consistently low in Alg 1 scores despite making huge gains this year. A contributing factor could be high turnover rate among teachers in that department. Now that vacancies are filled, identifying the ideal teacher to move students is key to student engagement and success.

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

Within Alg 1 we went from 30% proficiently to 43% proficiently. More specifically students went from 27% on PM1 to 43% on PM3.
New co-teacher was added as well as Focused ELP with small group pullouts. Focused scheduling occurred to ensure students were properly placed. Focused on data analysis and level of rigor/ benchmark in our PLCs.

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

Attendance is an area of concern due to the fact we have a transient population. Another area of concern is disproportionate discipline among ethnic groups. Due to this concern, several preventative measures have been put in place this year to include adding mentoring clubs, new personal that have focused on building relationships and implementing restorative practices, student incentives, and PBIS.

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

1. (Academics) Additional support prior to Alg 1 EOC and Geometry.
2. (Behavior) Implementing PBIS incentives and rewards.
3. (Attendance) Working with PSLT/MTSS to track attendance. Implementing an incentive party for students at the end of each Semester who have maintained and improved attendance.

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.

A positive school culture encourages student attendance and decreases discipline, which are key elements in a student's academic success and a school's successful graduation rate. By having structure and procedures in place, a stress-free environment is created allowing students to focus on academic needs.

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

Student attendance will increase, and student discipline will decrease with proper supports in place to assist students with accountability.

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

Attendance and Behavior is monitored by weekly PSLT meetings where data is tracked and discussed among all stakeholders. Interventions are put into place to obtain desired outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lora Morgan (lora.morgan@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.)

The implementation of PBIS and following a Tier 1 Schoolwide Behavior plan will be monitored through MTSS, PSLT, and SEL interventions. Students will have access to resources that will support them in maximizing their academic experience. Having consistent classroom procedures and school-wide procedures demonstrate equitable student outcomes and accountability.

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

By paying close attention to the EWS with systems and procedures in place, this can improve attendance, achievement, discipline, academics, and even the school's overall graduation rate.

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.

Create Tier 1 schoolwide behavior plan
Put PBIS into place
Set expectations early on with Town Hall Meetings
Student Incentives each 9 weeks
Attendance monitoring by SSW

Discipline Data tracked by CCRT and Admin
Utilize clubs and sports teams to be leaders on campus.

Person Responsible: Lora Morgan (lora.morgan@hcps.net)

By When: Will be completed throughout the year with the end of the year having the desired outcome.

#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.

Based on observation data and state assessment data, pushing rigorous instruction through the lower quartile would assist in improving student learning gains. This allows for students to be challenged and facilitate deeper learning.

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

Obtain a positive increase on all statewide assessments for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Review PM and common assessment data in regard to EOC courses to determine areas of strengths and areas of improvement needed. Based on areas of need, we will work with PLC's to determine next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Pettit (christopher.pettit@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.)

Using PLC planning collaboration and informative assessments that is data based to drive intentional and rigorous instruction in order to increase our student's academic learning gains.
District Resource teacher support will be utilized as well as feedback based from classroom visits.

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

Pushing rigorous instruction through the lower quartile would assist in improving student learning gains. Utilizing resources, consistent PLC's and data will allow teachers to better meet the needs of students.

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.

Professional Developments
PLC
Utilizing Resource Teachers

Person Responsible: Christopher Pettit (christopher.pettit@hcps.net)

By When: May of 2024