

Leon County Schools

Tallahassee Classical School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Tallahassee Classical School

4141 ARTEMIS WAY, Tallahassee, FL 32311

www.tlhclassical.org

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.

To train the minds and improve the hearts of young people through a content-rich classical education in the liberal arts and sciences, with instruction in the principles of moral character and civic virtue.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tallahassee Classical School will develop exemplary citizens that are virtuous, thoughtful, articulate, and possess a life-long passion for learning.

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
Wynn, Cara	Principal	<p>The principal is expected to:</p> <p>Develop and implement the school's vision and mission.</p> <p>Implement, evaluate and report the school's goals and objectives, as stated in the charter, to key stakeholders, including the district School Board and superintendent.</p> <p>Maintain a positive School/community climate and a safe and healthy environment.</p> <p>Encourage teachers and pupils to perform to the best of their ability; and enforce professional dress code.</p>
		<p>The principal is expected to:</p> <p>Instructionally</p> <p>Plan, implement, and evaluate the school instructional program based on student needs and within state guidelines.</p> <p>Supervise and coordinate School-wide programs, curricula and course options.</p> <p>Review teacher lesson plans and instruction to ensure correlation with the Florida Standards.</p> <p>Coordinate and supervise the testing and assessment program; and ensure that all academic components of the school's charter are being met.</p>
		<p>Student Outcomes</p> <p>To ensure students achieve to their greatest potential, the principal must:</p> <p>Compile and prepare all student achievement outcomes.</p> <p>Solicit input from all stakeholder groups and facilitate the development of a School Improvement Plan (SIP) that addresses all aspects of school and student.</p>
Finney, April	Assistant Principal	<p>The job responsibilities would include but not limited to overseeing the front desk, the tardies and attendance of students and incoming of visitors. They would be overseeing the clinic and business office. The Assistant Principal would also supervise the teachers in grades 7-11 in the area of academics and discipline. They would coordinate all events for grades PS-11th.</p>
Pitts, Hannah	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal would supervise grades K-6th. They would oversee academics and discipline for these grades and coach teachers as needed. They would supervise the Mentor Program and help teachers obtain their SOE and their Certifications. They would oversee lesson plans and grading. They would also oversee the MTSS/ESE Process.</p>
Stringer, Michelle	Assistant Principal	<p>This position oversees all compliance pieces and ensures that everything is completed on time and paperwork is filed. They also act as the Registrar and supervise the process by which families enroll and withdraw from our school.</p>

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.

The administration will look at the student data (grades, test scores) and then present it to the teachers. Together they will set up benchmarks for the students to reach for each progress monitoring period. The data will then be presented to the school board and parents to get their input and involvement on improving test scores,

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 reviewed after each PM period to determine whether goals have been met. The administrative team will review the SIP and report back to the school board at the meeting closest to the time of the PM period.

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)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
Charter School	Yes
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

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	12	13	11	10	6	6	9	7	74	
One or more suspensions	0	6	8	0	0	3	0	1	2	20	
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	2	12	9	9	10	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	15	14	21	20	72	
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	1	1	

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	3	0	0	6	2	4	10	27

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	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	6
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	12	13	11	10	6	6	9	7	5	82
One or more suspensions	6	8	0	0	3	0	1	2	1	23
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	2	12	9	9	10	9	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	15	14	21	20	7	81
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	1	0	1

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	2	3	0	0	6	2	4	10	6	36

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	2	2	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5

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	12	13	11	10	6	6	9	7	5	79
One or more suspensions	6	8	0	0	3	0	1	2	1	21
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	2	12	9	9	10	9	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	15	14	21	20	7	79
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	1	0	1

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	2	3	0	0	6	2	4	10	6	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	2	2	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3

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*	50	45	53	48	46	55	54		
ELA Learning Gains				49			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			50		
Math Achievement*	45	44	55	43	40	42	55		
Math Learning Gains				46			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			21		
Science Achievement*	31	39	52	36	43	54	43		
Social Studies Achievement*		55	68	58	52	59	65		
Middle School Acceleration		55	70	75	42	51			
Graduation Rate		52	74		39	50			
College and Career Acceleration		23	53		48	70			
ELP Progress	48	56	55		65	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	234
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
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	2	2
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	29	Yes	2	1
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	29	Yes	2	1

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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	37	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	50			45			31					48
SWD	20			27							3	
ELL	27			53							3	48
AMI												
ASN	80			100							2	
BLK	40			24			20				4	
HSP	45			36							3	
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	53			52			29				4	
FRL	35			29			10				4	

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	48	49	37	43	46	33	36	58	75			
SWD	18	39	31	23	33	27						
ELL	40	50		47	75							
AMI												
ASN	85			92								
BLK	38	46	43	26	32	38	18	62				
HSP	46	44		46	53		29					
MUL				40								
PAC												
WHT	53	49	31	50	51	29	56	50				
FRL	37	43	40	29	39	38	21	50				

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	54	45	50	55	32	21	43	65				
SWD	32	57		56	36		60					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	39	44	41	26		24	62				
HSP	25	30		50								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	54		64	33		67					
FRL	47	43		44	32		36					

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	50%	51%	-1%	50%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	55%	-19%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	47%	49%	-2%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	49%	-8%	47%	-6%
09	2023 - Spring	60%	50%	10%	48%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	57%	48%	9%	47%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	55%	-3%	54%	-2%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	51%	-7%	48%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	57%	-11%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	49%	7%	55%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	52%	-14%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	22%	38%	-16%	44%	-22%
05	2023 - Spring	18%	50%	-32%	51%	-33%

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

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	48%	16%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	65%	4%	63%	6%

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.

Our grade five math scores had the lowest performance. We determined that our curriculum, while rigorous and comprehensive, was not aligned with the Florida standards with which the test assessed the students.

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

Fifth grade ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year. We believe the number one factor that contributed to this decline was the turnover of faculty in this grade. For various reasons the teachers in this grade left and in one case then returned, one was sub-standard in their ability to teach. These factors influenced the student's ability to learn and caused an unstable learning environment.

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.

Fifth grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We believe the factors were both the teacher turnover, teacher inadequacy and using the standards to drive the instruction.

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

Sixth grade ELA was 12% higher than the state average. We hired an experienced teacher who was well versed in using the Florida standards.

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

Absences and low scores in math are two potential areas for concern.

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

Teacher certification, ESOL training/endorsement, reading endorsement, using standards and test data to drive instruction, and increased parental involvement to help reduce 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.

In the area of Teacher Retention and Recruitment, we began by looking at our Vision and Mission Statements and making sure that our hiring process reflected those values. We added a week of in-service training to equip teachers to be prepared for the beginning of the school year. Additionally, we have set up a mentor-mentee program for each of our new teachers so they have an accountability system in place where certification can be accomplished quickly.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome would be that the teachers who begin the year with a contract would also end the year with us. Each teacher who is not certified, would take the necessary steps toward certification.

Monitoring:

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

They will have quarterly check-ins with their dean.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hannah Pitts (hpitts@tlhclassical.org)

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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 looked at the elementary math scores and compared them to the district and state scores and determined this was our biggest area of concern.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will try to achieve a 15% increase for the lowest scoring subgroup in math by PM 3 by 2024 and then incrementally increase the other scores as needed.

Monitoring:

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

After each PM period we will meet to discuss the scores to determine if this goal is being worked on.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hannah Pitts (hpitts@tlhclassical.org)

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

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

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.)

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