Elizabeth Cobb Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Elizabeth Cobb Middle School

915 HILLCREST AVE, Tallahassee, FL 32308

https://www.leonschools.net/cobb

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.

The mission of Elizabeth Cobb Middle School is to provide high standards of education in a caring and safe learning environment that prepares all students for high school and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide high quality education that is robust and relevant to the real world and fosters the knowledge and skills that our students need for success in high school, college, and careers.

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
Millard, William	Principal	
Wallace, Jameeka	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We will have copies of the School Improvement Plan available at Open House for parents to review and provide feedback prior to reviewing the plan with the School Advisory Council for approval.

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 administrative team will meet with data team members monthly to review student progress towards goals.

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)	Middle School 6-8

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	72%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	45	78	79	202
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	68	61	155
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	77	98	214
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	76	89	219
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
	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	31	71	79	181

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	1	1	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	9

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	77	87	79	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	61	45	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	109	93	272
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	96	101	300
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	71	55	184

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	83	82	76	241

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	6	2	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	10

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	77	87	79	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	61	45	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	109	93	272
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	96	101	300
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	71	55	184

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	83	82	76	241

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	6	2	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	10

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*	49	52	49	49	53	50	46		
ELA Learning Gains				45			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			26		
Math Achievement*	45	58	56	45	34	36	41		
Math Learning Gains				47			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			22		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	44	51	49	47	55	53	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	54	75	68	59	61	58	62		
Middle School Acceleration	84	67	73	77	47	49	74		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	40	42	40		73	76			

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	316
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
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	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	61			
BLK	43			
HSP	49			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	40	Yes	2	

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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	61			
BLK	41			
HSP	53			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	49			45			44	54	84			40
SWD	25			15			25	24			4	
ELL	26			26							3	40
AMI												
ASN	61			61							2	
BLK	36			35			27	40	75		5	
HSP	53			38			39	64			4	
MUL	41			44			50	33	89		5	
PAC												
WHT	73			66			80	80	94		5	
FRL	32			29			28	33	80		5	

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	49	45	30	45	47	38	47	59	77			
SWD	25	27	24	22	28	21	18	38				
ELL	35	42		45	63							
AMI												
ASN	53	45		73	73							
BLK	39	39	29	33	41	37	36	47	68			
HSP	47	35	36	44	52	42	69	64	85			
MUL	54	56	29	51	43	33	67	52	94			
PAC												
WHT	72	54	35	68	59	44	63	86	82			
FRL	33	37	32	28	39	37	31	39	63			

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	46	42	26	41	28	22	46	62	74			
SWD	28	29	19	25	28	22	29	38				
ELL	53	73		53	33							

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	69	70		75	60							
BLK	34	35	25	28	19	16	33	49	59			
HSP	50	45		44	29			79				
MUL	49	41	40	52	30		64	87	91			
PAC												
WHT	71	57	21	68	46	50	70	83	89			
FRL	30	31	21	24	21	19	34	47	68			

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
07	2023 - Spring	45%	49%	-4%	47%	-2%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	49%	-1%	47%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	47%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	51%	-8%	48%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	25%	49%	-24%	55%	-30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	5%	38%	-33%	44%	-39%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	58%	27%	50%	35%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	58%	38%	48%	48%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	65%	11%	63%	13%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	72%	-17%	66%	-11%

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 lowest component is the percentage of students proficient in ELA who are in the lowest 25th percentile. Only 30% of those students were proficient. Students in need of interventions played a part in this low performance.

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

The component that had the greatest decline was the percentage of ELL students who showed Learning Gains in ELA. A contributing factor for this was an increase in the number of ELL students.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap with the state average was Social Studies proficiency. The state average was 69% proficient, while Cobb was at 59% proficient. One factor that played a part in this was student reading levels.

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

There was a 19% increase in Math Learning Gains. Monitoring data and making instructional adjustments through the curriculum contributed positively to this area.

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

In reviewing the EWS data, two areas of concern are students who were absent more than 10% of the time (202) and students that have 2 or more factors (181). These numbers represent nearly 1/3 of the students enrolled.

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

Priorities for this year are to increase Science Proficiency, Increase The percentage of students making Learning Gains in ELA, reduce the number of students receiving suspensions, and reduce the number of students with 10% or more absenteeism.

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment
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.
Positive school culture and environment leads to positive outcomes for students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
70% or more of all staff will indicate they agree with items on the annual climate survey.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Administrators will complete informal check-ins with teacher and support staff leaders to address any areas of concern throughout the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
William Millard (millardw@leonschools.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.)
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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

Students with Disabilities will increase their proficiency on the ELA test. For the past 3 years, this subgroup has been below 41% proficient.

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

At least 42% of students with disability will score proficient on the ELA FSA test.

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

Data team members will meet monthly to monitor the progress of students towards proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jameeka Wallace (wallacej2@leonschools.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.)

Students with disabilities will receive instruction in the area of Reading though intervention classes and learning strategy classes.

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

Students will receive consistent, ongoing support through the school year.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

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.

Economically Disadvantaged students will increase their proficiency on the ELA portion of the FSA. Last year, only 38% of students who are economically disadvantaged were proficient.

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

At least 42% of students who are economically disadvantaged will achieve proficiency on the ELA portion of FAST.

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

Data team members will meet monthly to monitor the progress of students towards proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Students who are economically disadvantaged who are in need of additional support will be placed in intervention groups and will have intensive reading on their schedule.

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

Students requiring additional support will receive support from certified teachers.

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

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).

Funding will be reviewed with the School Advisory Council as needed to ensure that funds are being allocated correctly.