South County Career Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

South County Career Center

2810 JOHN SHERMAN WAY, Ruskin, FL 33570

[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.

SCCC will provide a comprehensive, collaborative environment to nurture and ensure the academic and personal success of our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South County Career Center provides and opportunity for our students to achieve academic success and to move forward towards their career. It is the goal of our faculty and staff to assist our students so that they may be successful in their coursework, earn a high school diploma, and either further their education or seek gainful employment. Support is provided to help our students achieve the skills and attitudes essential for success in their careers as well as their lives.

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
Woods, Jennifer	Principal	As it relates to SIP, job duties and responsibilities for the principal are to ensure compliance of the timeline, to develop with the instructional team the yearly goals, objectives, and strategies
Garcia, Leonel	Teacher, ESE	SAC Chair, Completed SIP waivers with faculty.
Lerch, Ryan	Teacher, ESE	CTA representative. Provide assistance from previous years data to compare.
Caplinger, Juanita	Administrative Support	She helps with everything ranging from Classes to administering surveys and PBIS.

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.

Students- Student Council, Peer Counseling, Surveys.
Teachers- Teacher Leaders academically and through committee roles, PLCs, Committees, Survey, Pre-planning.
Leadership- ILT meetings, Pre- planning, post planning, survey.

Stakeholder input was used in developing the school's Mission and goals for the 2023-2024 school year.

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 school's SAC team will have meetings preceding every parent- teacher conference. We will also use Committee meetings and ILT meetings to discuss SAC based topics such as SIP implementation and monitoring monthly.

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)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	2	2
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	3	11	141
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	8
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	3	10	96

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	3	11	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	14
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	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	8
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

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	3	10	13

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*	10	51	53	16	51	55	8		
ELA Learning Gains				19			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	2	50	55	5	41	42	4		
Math Learning Gains				18			15		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	23	48	52	5	48	54	3		
Social Studies Achievement*	15	65	68	13	57	59	19		
Middle School Acceleration		70	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate	50	83	74	52	44	50	53		
College and Career Acceleration	18	33	53	6	68	70	7		
ELP Progress		52	55		73	70			

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	118
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	86
Graduation Rate	50

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	17
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	134
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	90
Graduation Rate	52

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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	36	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	4	
HSP	17	Yes	4	4
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	29	Yes	4	4
FRL	18	Yes	4	4

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	23	Yes	3	3
ELL	29	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	17	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	22	Yes	3	3
FRL	15	Yes	3	3

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	10			2			23	15		50	18	
SWD										18	2	
ELL											1	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										0	2	
HSP	8			5			22	7		12	6	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT				0			30			47	4	
FRL	11			3			21	5		20	6	

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	16	19		5	18		5	13		52	6	
SWD	9									36		
ELL										58	0	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										69	10	
HSP				5			8	11		54	5	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										36	7	
FRL	10	8		6	20		7	14		53	4	

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	8	33		4	15		3	19		53	7	
SWD	9			0	20					54	8	
ELL				8						66	5	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				7						70	0	
HSP	7	27		2	18		5	15		48	3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT				8						52	25	
FRL	8	33		5	13		3	18		55	5	

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	28%	50%	-22%	50%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	48%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	2%	55%	-53%	50%	-48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	2%	49%	-47%	48%	-46%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	62%	-39%	63%	-40%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	10%	65%	-55%	63%	-53%

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.

The subgroup of students that showed the lowest performance were Hispanics in Math scores. The level 3 Hispanic students for Math was 4.5% which is lower than the 5.3% in the total population. This is a trend from last year where Hispanic Math level 3s were at 2.4% compared to the 4.4% of the total population. Contributing factors could be lack of prior math content of teachers coming from their previous schools. Also, a lack of knowledge in reading and analyzing math questions.

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

Our biggest decline as a school was in English Language Arts gains where we went from 33.3% to 18.8% of our total student body that made gains in their English scores. I would attribute a huge factor of the decline to this data from the first year fully back physically to school from covid. We had a lot of staff and students out sick which caused gaps in student learning, especially in our student population.

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 biggest gap for the school year was in our English Language Arts gains. Statewide 53.3% of students made gains compared to us at 18.8%. Key factors are our student population are usually not students that spend all four years at our school and this data coming from a comeback covid year could have caused possible inaccuracies in the data.

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

The number of our students that tested bumped up from 75% to 90% which was a 15% increase from year to year. Our school started holding students more accountable for having to test if benchmarks were not met and the possibility of them getting withdrawn from the school if they did not complete graduation required tests.

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

Attendance is an area of concern for us. To counter it we established an attendance goal. We aim to reach an attendance goal of 80% for at least 8 out of the 9 months.

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

1. Utilizing current Insight data, alongside FSA?SAT?ACT data, we will provide academic opportunities to staff allowing individualized instruction goals.
2. We will successfully increase or maintain a monthly average school wide student attendance to reach or exceed 80% for at least 8 out of 9 months.
3. Develop and implement social emotional learning skills that were identified in the Panorama survey specifically supports/ environment and competencies.
4. We will support more reading strategies.

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.

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder
groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners. Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

The school aims to make gains of 5% in the Sense of Belonging, Teacher- Student Relationships, and Social Awareness categories of our Panorama survey.

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

We will use the Panorama survey and Schoolwide Success committee to monitor progress towards the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Juanita Caplinger (juanita.caplinger@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.)

We will be able to address the students' areas of concern by analyzing the data provided by the Fall 2023 Panorama survey. We will also emphasize the cultural goals in our first period peer counseling classes, mentor classes and use the class reps to provide feedback.
Step 1. View results from our 2022-2023 Panorama survey and discuss ways to achieve our desired outcome.
Step 2. Change 1st period peer counseling to reflect the wants and needs of students to create classes that are focused on activities students will build a sense of belonging in and build better relationships with the teachers.
Step 3. Increase the frequency students meet with their mentors from once a month to twice a month and increase the time with mentors to a full class period. This will enable students to have another teacher they can build a relationship with and create social awareness within the school.
Step 4. Conduct a Panorama survey to see if we have moved closer to our goals.
Step 5. Look at the data and change things appropriately for the 2nd semester based on student's responses from the 1st semester Panorama survey.

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

We want to improve our lowest scores on the Panorama survey by at least 5% in each of the areas listed above.

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 3 - Promising 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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 want to utilize current Insight data, alongside State Assessment data to provide necessary instructional staff opportunities to set individualized goal through onsite training to better meet the needs of the students.

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

The use of WICOR strategies in classrooms for most (75% or better) of assignments. We will also use insight data and student benchmark achievements to see improvements.

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

We will monitor it using classroom walkthroughs and follow up of utilization of WICOR strategies aligned to the teacher's individualized goals and learning objective.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Woods (jenniferl.woods@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.)

Mrs. Woods will leave 2 positives and a push. She will also provide scheduled feedback to teachers who want it or need it. We will also have monthly PD for our monthly meetings.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus