

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Westchase 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Westchase Elementary School

9517 W LINEBAUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33626

[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.

Where young minds are developed to be effective decision makers who are motivated, responsible community leaders prepared for the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A successful school requires strong leadership in all aspects, including administration, teachers, staff, parents, outside community members, and students. Working together as a team, we will achieve the ultimate goal of having each child reach their full potential academically, socially, and emotionally, so they are fully prepared for the life that lies ahead of them.

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
Trafficante, Alexa	Principal	The principal is responsible for administering and supervising the total school program and providing educational leadership for the students and staff members consistent with the educational goals of the community. These goals include establishing a climate conducive to learning, defining roles, planning and coordinating programs, effecting change, and decision-making.
Williamson, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	Schedules and creates agendas for monthly meetings and facilitates meeting with SAC committee.
Spear, Raymond	Assistant Principal	Assisting the principal in administering and supervising the total school program and providing educational leadership for the students and staff members consistent with the educational goals of the community. These goals include establishing a climate conducive to learning, defining roles, planning and coordinating programs, effecting change, and decision-making.

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.

Meetings were conducted with stakeholders to review data and gather input. Summer, 2023, teachers and parents came together for a "Vision Meeting" to review past years data, trends, and identify potential

barriers. With that in mind, our instructional priorities were modified to best fit the needs of our students and staff. In August, additional data and school priorities were presented to the SAC committee and input was taken to ensure instructional priorities targeted school needs.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored frequently at leadership meetings, quarterly data chats, and SAC meetings monthly to ensure students are making adequate progress based on common assessments. Instructional priorities will be modified if needed in addition to support.

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	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	24%
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	22	16	11	11	16	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	20	14	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	10	14	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	11	12	0	0	0	33
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	2	2	0	4	5	0	0	0	13

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
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	2	23	16	14	10	14	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	12	12	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	16	8	0	0	0	31
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	1	2	1	0	0	0	4

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	2	23	16	14	10	14	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	12	12	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	16	8	0	0	0	31
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	1	2	1	0	0	0	4

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*	71	50	53	77	53	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				71			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			46		
Math Achievement*	78	56	59	81	50	50	85		
Math Learning Gains				78			82		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			69		
Science Achievement*	74	50	54	67	59	59	79		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	71	59	59	70			61		

** 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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	557
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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK				
HSP	67			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	59			

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	46			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	70			
HSP	63			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	53			

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	71			78			74					71
SWD	29			38			30				4	
ELL	54			67							3	69
AMI												
ASN	77			90			90				4	
BLK												
HSP	64			69			67				5	70
MUL	73			77							2	
PAC												
WHT	73			80			77				4	
FRL	50			54			54				5	76

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	77	71	57	81	78	56	67					70
SWD	41	61	46	49	57	46	19					
ELL	59	70	50	65	70	73	46					70
AMI												
ASN	86	79		93	89							
BLK	70			70								
HSP	64	71	54	65	75	61	49					67
MUL	88	75		87	50							
PAC												
WHT	80	71	61	87	80	50	73					
FRL	52	53	40	58	69	53	45					

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	81	72	46	85	82	69	79					61
SWD	39	29	21	47	71	62	29					
ELL	77			81			90					61
AMI												
ASN	97	93		95	75		94					
BLK	64			71								
HSP	74	59		74	71		71					50
MUL	81	83		85	92		71					
PAC												
WHT	83	72	48	88	87	78	82					
FRL	62	41		62	50		22					

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	69%	53%	16%	54%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	54%	21%	58%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	46%	18%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	77%	55%	22%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	53%	22%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	47%	23%	51%	19%

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.

After reviewing data, it was evident that our students in 3rd-5th who performed at a level one on PM1 did not move at the rate of their peers (3rd - 34.9% remaining level 1, 4th - 34.4% remaining level 1, and 5th 35% remaining in level 1). Contributing factors identified were language competency and missing foundations in reading/phonics.

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

The lowest performance was in 3rd grade ELA. Only 65% of students were proficient based upon FAST PM3. The contributing factors were language competency and missing foundations in reading/phonics.

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.

We outperformed the state average in all areas ELA, Math, and Science. The smallest gap differential was in ELA only performing 15% above state average.

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

We showed the most improvement in 5th Grade Science. This was due to the implementation of standards-based planning (vertical and grade-level), analysis of assessments and planning to include areas of need, intentional practices and meaningful follow-up as a result of assessment from core instruction.

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

Reflecting on Early Warning Signs, two potential areas of concern are our students consistently performing in the bottom quartile and absent over 10% of the time.

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

- Priority 1 - Provide students opportunities to contribute to the positive learning climate by authentically interacting in student discourse and being responsive to one another.
- Priority 2 - Increasing FAST levels of students specifically bottom quartile in ELA and Math.
- Priority 3 - Provide an equitable learning experience using strategic small group instruction and the use of common assessment data/real-time progress monitoring to meet students' academic needs.

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.

Increase student achievement by explicitly communicating expectations both verbally and visually and providing opportunities for learners to contribute to the positive learning climate by authentically interacting in student discourse and being responsive to one another.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With creating positive classroom environments which promote student voice and accountability, we will decrease from 14% of students with absences more than 10% to less than 10% of students.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative and Student Services team will collaboratively work together to monitor student attendance and communicate with parents to problem-solve potential barriers leading to student absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexa Trafficante (alex.trafficante@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.)

Through conducting classroom walk-throughs, we will monitor and track positive and collaborative learning environment being fostered by stakeholders. Professional development and coaching cycles will be provided to those who do not display evidence of such environments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Creating positive classroom environments has been known to increase student attendance and achievement.

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.

Administration, Student Services, and teachers will collaboratively work together to ensure students are attending school regularly and implementing attendance plans and incentives when necessary. Attendance issues and interventions will be reviewed at MTSS meetings and administration will work with School Social Worker to create plans with parents to ensure students are not missing instructional minutes.

Person Responsible: Alexa Trafficante (alex.trafficante@hcps.net)

By When: Beginning Aug, Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on our rate of progress with our students in the lowest 25th percentile, we have identified the need for more targeted support/small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By providing differentiated small groups in reading and mathematics as a result of ongoing formative assessments (UFLI, Dibels, and common assessments in ELA and Mathematics), we will see movement in ELA and Math proficiency (Goal 5%).

Monitoring:

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

Observation and data analysis of common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexa Trafficante (alex.trafficante@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.)

Data analysis at data meetings to plan and differentiate instruction and purposeful planning of small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ECTAC Florida evidence-based strategies on using data to differentiate instruction and the power of small group instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Instructional coaching by administration, regular feedback by administration, use of formal assessments (exit tickets) to drive instructional practices, collaborative planning sessions to ensure plans are clear and aligned to B.E.S.T standards, and individualized professional development based on observed teacher and school-wide trends.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Beginning August, Ongoing

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).