

Pasco County Schools

Wiregrass Ranch High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Wiregrass Ranch High School

2909 MANSFIELD BLVD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33543

<https://wrhs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

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.

Show Respect: Reach for Excellence, Strive for the best, Plan for the future, Engage in amazing ideas, Concentrate on core values, Treat each other with kindness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of WRHS is to empower students to be college, career, and life ready, and to reach their highest potential.

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
Packard, Krystal	Assistant Principal	Physical Education, Fine Arts and Foreign Language as well as Discipline, PBIS and 10th grade
White, Robyn	Principal	Oversees leadership and leadership structures as well as Math.
Rankin, Christy	Assistant Principal	ESE, Professional development, 9th grade monitoring, MTSS and SIT
McCoy, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Assists with School Leadership team, PTSA, SAC, Professional development,
Vergne, Diamela	Assistant Principal	Science, SOS Program and 12th grade
Taylor, Allison	Assistant Principal	ELA, Reading and Master schedule

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.

WRHS created our SIP based on school wide data pulled from testing scores and trends, Core Action 1, 2 & 3, data from walk throughs, Gallup Poll, Teacher survey, student with disabilities testing performance and graduation rates. The school wide information was gathered from PLC's, School Leadership, Department heads, school counselors, students and our community based on the various sources listed

and their respected audience.

The following is our leadership team outside administration:

Last Name First Name Team

Berry Paula English 1

Billington Cathy Director of School Culture

Bracciale Nicole Geometry

Calzone Jeremy US History

Campbell Brendan EGP/Eng 4

Charneske Daniel Biology

Cuviello Nick Chemistry

Davis Kelly English 2

Fraser* Donna CTE

Hassett Cynthia Algebra 1

Hensley Kristine Director of Community and Parent Partnerships

Kantor* Melinda ESE Department

Kincaid Stephanie New Teacher Ally

Lindstrand* Carrie Fine Arts

Marsh Robert Econ/Government

Nissen Amanda Statistics

Nissen Scott World History

Pedrero Michael Algebra 2

Rogers* Chris PE Department

Sanchez* Anetta World Language Department

Schumacher Daphne Textbook Coordinator

Freiser Marlene LDC Coach

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))

We will monitor goal 1 through school leadership meetings, PLC's and quarterly data dives as well as walk throughs will take place for the 3 Core Actions. Professional development will focus to strengthen staff knowledge and implementation to increase Core Action 3. Kagan strategies will be presented at staff meetings with expectations of classroom implementation. For goal 2 we have created 2 new roles on our SLT, Director of School Culture and Director of Community and Parent Partnerships. Through these roles we will implement and monitor employee engagement. We will also work to identify and support our SIT students in the areas of student hope and student belonging by making the staff more aware and incorporating our school social worker and social service coordinator as mentors and to help monitor and report out at our MTSS meetings.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	62	49	50	68	51	51	69		
ELA Learning Gains				58			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			47		
Math Achievement*	54	40	38	66	35	38	60		
Math Learning Gains				54			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			33		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	78	66	64	76	50	40	78		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	67	66	75	49	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	95	91	89	97	63	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	79	67	65	53	68	67	56		
ELP Progress	73	46	45	64			65		

* 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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	700
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	97

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	45			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	64			
HSP	68			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	65			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	59			
HSP	58			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	56			

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	62			54			78	76		95	79	73
SWD	30			29			51	34		31	6	
ELL	32			37			59	39		72	7	73
AMI												
ASN	81			76			92	91		96	6	
BLK	51			36			68	70		63	6	
HSP	51			47			71	72		73	7	69
MUL	64			56			86	95		91	6	
PAC												
WHT	65			59			80	75		83	6	
FRL	51			42			68	66		70	7	64

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	68	58	45	66	54	44	76	75		97	53	64
SWD	23	40	30	31	41	32	19	45		96	19	
ELL	41	60	62	46	49	33	57	38		100	32	64
AMI												
ASN	89	76		83	73		92	70		100	86	
BLK	69	57	50	59	56	36	71	66		97	32	
HSP	60	54	39	53	51	44	62	70		95	45	64
MUL	64	54		68	48		85	64		91	52	
PAC												
WHT	69	58	45	73	54	50	82	83		98	59	64
FRL	56	55	39	56	48	39	65	66		96	38	57

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	69	57	47	60	35	33	78	70		96	56	65
SWD	28	30	23	30	27	15	47	48		98	8	
ELL	36	48	40	44	27	19	52	44		95	50	65

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	80	62		82	43		94	69		100	82	
BLK	64	54	50	44	33	34	61	65		98	39	
HSP	61	56	43	56	32	34	74	64		95	56	59
MUL	82	72		70	35		93	94		94	66	
PAC												
WHT	72	56	45	65	38	32	82	73		95	55	
FRL	54	46	39	51	28	24	66	58		91	48	76

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	65%	51%	14%	50%	15%
09	2023 - Spring	60%	48%	12%	48%	12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	50%	7%	50%	7%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	49%	7%	48%	8%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	65%	14%	63%	16%

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

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 data that showed the lowest performance was our SWD, they scored lower than our overall student population in ELA, Science and Math. We felt that Covid still had a part as well as students and families being aware that SWD can get waivers for testing so full effort is not given.

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

SWD and ELA gains as well as lowest 25%, SWD and ELA gains. We felt that Covid still had a part as well as students and families being aware that SWD can get waivers for testing so full effort is not given.

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.

No state average data is loaded at this time.

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

Math learning gains improved among all students including our lowest 25% and SWD. We focused on the new resources that the district purchased to make sure that rigorous curriculum was presented each day. We also did data reviews and data dives into the standards and student performance which lead to many opportunities to present remediation to students. Students had multiple attempts to gain mastery of the standards.

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

Data was only presented for k-8.

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

1) WRHS will continue to focus on Students with Disabilities and increasing their academic performance by 10% and the overall graduation rate by 5%.

2) While our Gallup Poll and Teacher Survey showed improved results, WRHS will continue to increase Employee Engagement by an additional 10%. In addition, WRHS will increase Student Hope and Belonging by an additional 10% by focusing on our Homeless Students and our underrepresented populations.

3) Data-Driven Decisions: WRHS will continue to focus on Students with Disabilities and increasing their academic performance by 10% and the overall graduation rate by 5%

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.

We have built new leadership positions to build positive culture on campus and to communicate to the community. Our area of focus is SWD and gaining higher level of mastery in ELA. The majority of our reading and ESE support facilitators are returning staff members, any new hires will have mentors and training to support them.

Measurable Outcome:

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

While our Gallup Poll and Teacher Survey showed improved results, WRHS will continue to increase Employee Engagement by an additional 10%. In addition, WRHS will increase Student Hope and Belonging by an additional 10% by focusing on our Homeless Students and our underrepresented populations.

WRHS will continue to focus on Students with Disabilities and increasing their academic performance by 10% and the overall graduation rate by 5%

Monitoring:

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

Gallup Poll, Teacher Survey, State and District Testing

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robyn White (rwhite@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Progress monitoring plans (PMP), Tier 3 interventions through Study Sync, Chalk Talk, individualized supports determined by individual student needs via IEPs, Intensive Reading support through collaborative teaching model, ESE support via team teaching model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research based approach to providing interventions for students at the tier three letter based on individual needs by standard.

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 ELA**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.

Improving ELA instructional practices with a focus on SWD is an area of focus this year. The gap is very large between SWD and all students. We plan on working with our ELA PLC's and ESE teachers to strengthen supports and meet the individual needs of our students in order to see growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

WRHS will continue to focus on Students with Disabilities and increasing their academic performance by 10% and the overall graduation rate by 5%

Monitoring:

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

ELA grade level PLC's will look at data at their weekly meetings and report out to the leadership team at quarterly data dives. There will be an increase focus on academic vocabulary. Our schools literacy team will also look at the data and build in interventions based on student support. ESE teachers and Reading teachers will push into ELA classrooms. Data that will be looked at to see where remediation is needed will include common formative and summative assessments as well as progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Taylor (artaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Progress monitoring plans (PMP), Tier 3 interventions through Study Sync, Chalk Talk, individualized supports determined by individual student needs via IEPs, Intensive Reading support through collaborative teaching model, ESE support via team teaching model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research based approach to providing interventions for students at the tier three level based on individual needs by standard.

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)).

As a system, the Pasco district is engaging in a continuous improvement process always, and annually, we have a more focused reflection to look forward to the next coming school year. During the year, each school reflects and responds to data at the minimum quarterly, and the system engages in regular Calibration Meetings throughout the school year. Additionally, after reflecting on current mid-year data, the system engages in Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). During this time, each school enters a needs assessment process that sets the stage for future planning and includes analysis of student performance, analysis of stakeholder feedback, self-assessment, and site visits. Subsequently, this analysis from each school drives the district planning process and the annual approach to Planning Forward to respond our schools, as well as the allocation of resources in an intentional manner based on the needs identified for each school.

Student Performance is analyzed by reviewing current and trend data by subgroup and school. Data sources include Florida BEST assessments, Statewide Science Assessment, district developed quarterly check results where applicable, and NWEA MAP Growth data. Stakeholder feedback is analyzed by reviewing results from both the student and staff Gallup polls, staff and parent surveys and focus groups.

Multiple tools are used to conduct a self-assessment. Each school and the district use the Cognia Standards for systems accreditation and each school and the district reviews and evaluates its progress toward goals set using the Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE). Instructional Practice Observations, Professional Learning Community (PLC) rubrics, and Tiers of Support rubrics are also completed by each school to gain insight into instructional and support practices.

An Assistant Superintendent, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Specialist, and District personnel engage in individual site visits with school leadership at each school after the school team has completed the first part of their analysis to gain insight into the school's unique needs as well as identify foci for school improvement efforts and needs for implementing the plan.

The conclusion of the CNA results in the identification of the root causes of barriers, the development of a school improvement plan to overcome/reduce barriers to improvement, the allocation of supports needed to implement each school's improvement plan and serves as the foundation for Planning Forward. Schools analyze their plans and basic allocations that will be provided based on district formulas to determine needs for additional allocations, resources and supports. With the school assistant superintendent and the school support team, each school then carefully aligns the additional available funds through Title 1 and/or UniSIG to specific strategies for improvement aimed at reducing barriers to achievement and closing learning gaps for underperforming student groups. This plan for use of additional funding is regularly monitored by the district support team, and is adjusted based on data, including student progress monitoring results, as applicable through the year, with the support of the state BSI team and the Department.