

Polk County Public Schools

Mulberry Senior 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	27
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	31

Mulberry Senior High School

4TH CIRCLE NE, Mulberry, FL 33860

<http://mhs.polk-fl.net>

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.

Mulberry High School is committed to preparing all students to become productive members of society through rigorous and relevant instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students at Mulberry High School will be exposed to rigorous instruction that promotes inquiry and allows for application of concepts and mastery of curriculum.

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
Monacelli, Gian	Assistant Principal	<p>Gian Monacelli, Assistant Principal: Assists in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, models the problem-solving process; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Effectively designs the master schedule in conjunction with Principal and school counselors. Works to ensure curriculum is implemented with fidelity and appropriate materials are provided for teachers to ensure student engagement, as well as to plan, coach, and monitor instructional practices. Oversees the School Counseling Department, English Department, Reading Department, and Curriculum Committee.</p>
Young, Michael	Principal	<p>Michael Young, Principal: Sets the vision for Mulberry High School through shared vision discussions along with providing professional development, as well as planning, coaching and monitoring for instructional staff. Supervises the development of a strong infrastructure, ensures that the school-based team is implements protocols with fidelity, conducts assessments of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support with fidelity, facilitates and participates in professional learning, develops a school-wide culture of expectation, ensures resources are assigned to the areas in most need, and communicates with all stakeholders. Directly oversees the Non-Teacher Departments and Administrative Team. Maintains a leadership protocol where decision-making is shared among the five administrators through specific distributive leadership assigned roles and responsibilities. This includes shared responsibility for providing planning, coaching, monitoring and evaluating instructional staff, as well as modeling appropriate practices and providing a safe and orderly environment. Oversees the Science Department, PE, and ROTC.</p>
Dixon, Melinda	Assistant Principal	<p>Melinda Dixon, Assistant Principal/Head of Program: Assists in various ways to provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, assists in processing discipline, as well as planning, coaching and monitoring for specific content areas' instructional practices. Works to maintain graduation coach tasks to ensure seniors are on track for graduation. Coordinates the AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) college-readiness program designed to help students develop the skills they need to close the achievement gap and be successful in college. Creates staff based learning opportunities and creates weekly instruction-based newsletter for staff. Leads school culture and climate activities. Oversees the Math Department and CTE academies.</p>
Murdock, Zachary	Assistant Principal	<p>Zachary Murdock, Assistant Principal: Assists in various ways to provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, assists in processing discipline, as well as planning, coaching and monitoring for specific content areas' instructional practices. Works to maintain discipline tasks and to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Oversees the Fine Arts Department, World Language Department, and Social Studies Department.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gable, Jerri	Dean	Jerri Gable, Dean of Students: Provides service for student discipline and facilities maintenance. Works to ensure order to allow learning to take place. Oversees the maintenance of discipline process/record-keeping, parent communication, student investigations and student transportation. Works directly with the school resource deputy to help ensure a safe and orderly environment.

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.

In conjunction with the administrative team and school leadership teams, all stakeholders are taken into account when developing the School Improvement Plan. The Principal meets directly with students in Student Government and in the Leadership class. The School Advisory Council is an integral part of the process and we ensure our council is comprised of parents and community partners. Our school is a driving force in writing the plan and is shared with students, faculty, staff, parents and community partners for the sake of transparency and as a compass to guide the in developing the School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

The School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored through Administrative meetings, updates with instructional coaches, and monthly PLCs with faculty. The leadership team will revisit the SIP during weekly calibration walks to ensure SIP goals are aligned to current expectations.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	247	
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	636	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	528

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	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	33	38	50	37	41	51	37		
ELA Learning Gains				44			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			35		
Math Achievement*	21	24	38	22	35	38	21		
Math Learning Gains				35			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31			30		
Science Achievement*	52	50	64	49	26	40	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	58	50	66	67	39	48	62		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	89	84	89	91	52	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	81	54	65	75	55	67	72		
ELP Progress	34	40	45	40			40		

** 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	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	525
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	91

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	50			
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				

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%
WHT	61			
FRL	50			

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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	46			

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	33			21			52	58		89	81	34
SWD	11			10			17	40		72	6	
ELL	10			20			35	32		68	7	34
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			15			44	52		79	6	
HSP	29			20			47	55		77	7	33

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
MUL	41			30							2	
PAC												
WHT	41			24			63	67		84	6	
FRL	27			19			47	56		81	7	35

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	37	44	34	22	35	31	49	67		91	75	40
SWD	18	36	26	13	28	27	21	40		87	56	
ELL	14	27	26	15	26	17	36	27		92	79	40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	45	39	4	36	29	28	61		100	71	
HSP	34	42	31	21	34	35	44	61		91	73	40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43	47	37	29	35	30	59	75		88	77	
FRL	34	42	35	20	37	33	45	60		91	74	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
All Students	37	42	35	21	22	30	50	62		95	72	40
SWD	15	32	25	10	18	26	24	34		90	40	
ELL	16	35	32	19	31	31	21	27		92	72	40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	34	31	7	7	8	32	73		100	69	
HSP	34	42	32	21	22	28	48	50		97	74	41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43	42	38	24	27	48	57	69		91	74	

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
FRL	32	38	29	21	21	28	45	58		94	65	32

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	35%	40%	-5%	50%	-15%
09	2023 - Spring	30%	39%	-9%	48%	-18%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	37%	-18%	50%	-31%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	37%	-9%	48%	-20%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	63%	-12%

HISTORY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	49%	7%	63%	-7%

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.

Learning loss gaps continue to effect our mathematics students. Though our overall mathematics proficiency did increase by 1%, our Algebra proficiency rate is the lowest area for our school at 19% proficiency. This four year trend continues to be an area of focus. The algebra teaching team meets weekly to collaborate and create working Learning Arcs to ensure alignment of the standard and the student tasks. Data throughout the year showed that students were missing key mathematical components that would enable them to find success in the algebra curriculum. Teachers spiraled in middle grades-level concepts to reenforce the necessary algebra content. Even with a strong planning team and a focus on alignment to the standard, there is still much work to do in this area. One focus for the coming year will be incorporating more equivalent experiences during the time in class to prepare for the state assessment.

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

Social Studies dropped from 67% proficiency to 56% proficiency. This 11% decline is unusual in this content area of US History. While the same two instructional staff were in place as previous years, there are some contributing factors.

With increased student enrollment, one of the two teachers was asked to take an all day teaching assignment.

Due to this, collaborative planning in US History was moved to after school. With time constraints, we feel that planning was not as effective as it had been in the past. In addition to this, state and district data also show a downward trend in this tested area for the 2023 year.

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 greatest gap was Algebra with a 34 percentage point difference than state data. One contributing factor is that state data includes accelerated students in middle school who take Algebra in seventh or eighth grades. These students trend toward higher pass rates than students who take Algebra 1 in high school for the first time. In addition to this, continued learning gaps persist from missing critical mathematical concepts in the middle grade years during the pandemic.

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

Geometry increased by 6 percentage points from 21% to 27% proficient. The team of Geometry teachers and administrator over mathematics met weekly for collaborative planning. There was a strong focus on the Learning Arc to ensure grade-level and content-level standards were the central focus of instruction. Tasks were created to align directly to the standard and this team prioritized equivalent testing experience opportunities for their students. This team also worked on data analysis with progress monitoring assessments to ensure spiraling back to most missed standards throughout the year.

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

There is no data populated for grades 9-12.

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

1. Algebra Proficiency Rates
2. ELA Proficiency Rates
3. Teacher Attendance
4. Increasing lower ESSA subgroup areas for SWD and ELL students

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 Attendance**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.

Certified teachers teaching has the highest impact on student success. Instruction by a qualified teachers impacts instruction and learning for students. Teacher attendance data from the 2022-2023 school year shows a total of 996 missed days by faculty. Finding substitutes and using paraprofessionals as substitutes was a daily issue. This coming school year, we have less paraprofessional availability. Our state assessment data proves that students need their instructional leaders in the classroom with them, leading their learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Faculty absenteeism will decrease by at least 10% in the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Principal will create a tracker/spreadsheet to monitor daily attendance. When a teacher shows a trend of absenteeism increasing (3+ days per quarter), the principal or assistant principal will have a conversation with the teacher to see if there are any supports that the teacher needs at the school level. Administration will continue displaying trend data on teacher absenteeism for the entire staff to keep it at the forefront. Also, quarterly incentives will be implemented to praise those teachers with positive attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Young (michael.young@polk-fl.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.)

Part 1: Monitor teacher attendance using tracking spreadsheet. Each teacher will have their attendance tracked at the school level with a spreadsheet. When a teacher misses 3+ days in any given quarter, administrator will conference with teacher to see what supports may be needed.

Part 2: Provide incentives/rewards quarterly to staff with positive attendance trends. Any staff member who misses 1 or no days in any given quarter will be provided with a jeans pass. Their names will also be put in a raffle to win prizes donated from the community. Multiple winners are possible.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Part 1: Providing the data to teachers ensures that they see the trend and can own the data

Part 2: Reward the positive correlation between certified teacher instructing student and student performance on state assessments

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.

Create spreadsheet to track teacher attendance data. Principal will create an excel spreadsheet that he will align with daily Aesop attendance information to track who is absent. When a teacher reaches 3+ days in any given quarter, that teacher will be flagged for conversation.

Person Responsible: Michael Young (michael.young@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Track data quarterly to meet with teachers who have high absenteeism trends

Person Responsible: Michael Young (michael.young@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing, quarterly

Provide quarterly incentives to staff with positive attendance rates for the quarter

Person Responsible: Michael Young (michael.young@polk-fl.net)

By When: At the end of each quarter

#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.

Implement structures to provide targeted supports for Students with Disabilities (SWD) for continuous improvement directly addressing our ESSA data reflecting only 35% of our SWD students meeting proficiency. These structures include a master schedule that includes Learning Strategies courses, 9 Inclusion teachers to support SWD students in core content areas, and Standards-Based Instruction following IEPs/Accommodations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD students will increase by 3%+ in academic proficiency on state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will use progress monitoring data in core content areas to check growth throughout the school year. LEA will closely monitor data of SWD students and spearhead interventions, as needed. Instructional coaches plan with teachers to ensure accommodations are implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dana Jennings (dana.jennings@polk-fl.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.)

For SWD students to gain better proficiency on state testing, provide additional supports by way of Learning Strategies classes, push-in structures with inclusion teachers, Corrective Interventions in Literacy Strategies, Math 180 Corrective Math Course, ELL Paraprofessional supports cohorts of students as needed, professional learning opportunities for general ed teachers, and mentoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our most recent ESSA data identifies our SWD component as an area for growth; as it is currently at 35%. Therefore, these students have been identified as a priority.

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.

Teachers identify SWD students and study their accommodations. LEA ensures each ESE Inclusion teacher has a detailed list of their case load and coordinating student IEPs. Teachers also familiarize with all SWD students' IEPs for who they support in inclusion classrooms.

Person Responsible: Dana Jennings (dana.jennings@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Restructure support facilitation teachers who push-in to academic courses to ensure personnel are best aligned with their areas of strength.

Person Responsible: Gian Monacelli (gian.monacelli@polk-fl.net)

By When: July 2023

Focus on writing in Learning Strategies classes.

Person Responsible: Dana Jennings (dana.jennings@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Track discipline data and create intervention plans for SWD students so that less instructional time is lost.

Person Responsible: Zachary Murdock (zachary.murdock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Implement HighTech 101 for additional support

Person Responsible: Dana Jennings (dana.jennings@polk-fl.net)

By When: As Needed

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

Implement structures to provide targeted supports for English Language Learners (ELL) for continuous improvement directly addressing our ESSA data reflecting only 36% of our ELL students meeting proficiency. These structures for support include incorporating ELLevation into curriculum for ELL students, adding Latinos in Action to the master schedule, including two LY shelter classes in the master schedule and allowing 2 ESOL Paraeducators the opportunity to work directly with ELL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELL students will increase by 3%+ in academic proficiency on state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will use ELA progress monitoring data to check growth throughout the school year. Our Literacy Coach and Success Coach will review progress monitoring and other applicable data (attendance, discipline, tutoring) with administrators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Zachary Murdock (zachary.murdock@polk-fl.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.)

Provide additional supports for ELL students to gain better proficiency on state testing and improve literacy as evidence of tasks aligning to benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy was based on our most recent ESSA data which identifies our ELL component as in need of improvement, under the 41% proficient criteria at 36%. Therefore, these students have been made a priority.

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.

Support ELL students in core classrooms with push-in support from bilingual, ELL Paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible: Zachary Murdock (zachary.murdock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Provide bilingual, peer supports in specific courses. When students are in core content courses, bilingual students will be paired with ELL students. Bilingual students with a teaching assistant course can be assigned to a classroom with ELL students to provide translation support in core content courses.

Person Responsible: Gian Monacelli (gian.monacelli@polk-fl.net)

By When: As Needed

Implement ELLevation for increased supports

Person Responsible: Zachary Murdock (zachary.murdock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Connect with Spanish-speaking parents through bilingual paraprofessional who reaches out to families for a school connection.

Person Responsible: Gian Monacelli (gian.monacelli@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

#4. 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.

It is imperative that our students are taught standards-based instruction and equally essential that they have multiple opportunities to work through tasks that are aligned to the pertinent standards. Equivalent experience opportunities enable students to prepare for the state assessments throughout the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Algebra will increase proficiency rates by at least 3% by incorporating additional equivalent experience questions to the state assessment at least once a week.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators assigned to Algebra Collaborative Planning Team will facilitate the utilization of the Learning Arc Tool at content specific planning to highlight Equivalent Experience questions. The team will create tasks that engage the standard at the appropriate depth. Tasks will be assigned to days on the lesson plan. Leadership team will monitor classrooms to check for fidelity of the aligned equivalent experience questions designed in planning being used as a learning tool in classrooms with students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melinda Dixon (melinda.dixon@polk-fl.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.)

Part 1. Monitor teachers using the Learning Arc to effectively plan in Algebra for Equivalent Experience questions/prompts.

Part 2. Monitor learning in Algebra classrooms to ensure equivalent experience questions are aligned effectively to benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Part 1. Using the Learning Arc to plan effective equivalent experiences in Algebra ensures that the planned questions align to the benchmark for both precision and depth.

Part 2. Providing opportunities for students to learn and interact with questions that align to the benchmark and mimic the state assessment.

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.

Part 1: Algebra Learning Arc planning includes equivalent experience opportunities, aligned to benchmark.
Part 2: Students have opportunities in class to learn through these equivalent experience questions/prompts.

Person Responsible: Melinda Dixon (melinda.dixon@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing weekly

Part 1. Administrators attend and participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions in Algebra. Administrators facilitate use of Learning Arc to unpack the depth of the standard, align tasks and equivalent experiences to the standard. Administrators ensure team provides common assessments and analyzes data.

Part 2. Monitor use of designed equivalent experience opportunities in classrooms for alignment to state benchmark. Ensure students have persistent and consistent opportunities to work through equivalent experience prompts.

Person Responsible: Melinda Dixon (melinda.dixon@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

#5. 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.

State testing data shows a 5% loss in proficiency in ELA from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State data will show a minimum of +3% proficiency increase for ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering standards being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gian Monacelli (gian.monacelli@polk-fl.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.)

Part 1: Ensure student tasks are accurately aligned to standard during collaborative planning.

Part 2: Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences and learning tasks aligned to state expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The relationship between academic success and ensuring students can engage in grade level standards-based expectations is critical to proficiency. Monitoring for this alignment will set the course for planning and professional learning frameworks.

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.

Part 1: ELA Learning Arc planning includes aligning student tasks and assessments to the appropriate standards at the correct depth.

Part 2: Students have opportunities in class to learn through these equivalent experience questions/prompts.

Person Responsible: Gian Monacelli (gian.monacelli@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing, weekly

Part 1. Administrators and instructional coaches attend and participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions in ELA.

Part 2. Monitor use of aligned tasks and assessment opportunities in classrooms for alignment to state benchmark.

Person Responsible: Gian Monacelli (gian.monacelli@polk-fl.net)

By When: 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)).

Funding allocation is based on data and the areas of need from this data become priority. We review district progress monitoring testing data throughout the year and then state assessment data at the end of the school year to determine which areas have the highest academic needs. Mathematics is a high-stakes, high-need area for us. We have used Title 1 funds to pay for a teacher to teach a course based on testing data. Students in the class, Math180, are provided with additional supports to prepare them for the Algebra State Assessment. We have also funded a Paraprofessional to support in a lab with these same students. We also continue to fund additional supports in ELA through instructional coaching to ensure they have additional support. In addition to our data-driven needs, we also involve our staff in creating goals for our school.

The administrative team participates in the district's Summer Leadership Academy to glean new initiatives, methods of exploring data, and is provided opportunities to learn from colleagues to best support all our students.

For our ELL students, we have two ELL support Paraprofessionals who push in to classrooms with high needs. We participated in our regional Data Com where district personnel reviewed our data and provided ideas of how we can improve student performance. We have addressed all of these areas in our district-reviewed School Improvement Plan.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring****Title I Requirements****Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Principal shares the SIP with entire staff at back to school week to begin the school year

School Advisory Council, comprised of parents, students, community stakeholders, business partners are given copies of the SIP and the information is explored as a group

Principal shares with Student Government

Faculty revisits SIP throughout the year during PLCs

Annual Title 1 Family Involvement Meeting addresses the SIP by Principal

Webpage

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

In addition to the annual Title 1 Family meeting, we offer FAFSA nights for families, we use multiple social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter) to invite parents to on-campus events. These include extra-curricular, sports, celebrations, etc... We use the school messenger call-out system and our website to keep stakeholders informed. We participate in our local Chamber events and many of our

students volunteer in the community and work at local businesses. Parent Portal is available at all times. We have Orientation and High School 101 night.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

One of the pillars of our academic strength is our weekly collaborative planning meetings. Like-content teachers create Learning Arcs around rich, academic conversations. To further elevate these planning sessions, we plan to focus heavily on Equivalent Experience questions/prompts this year. We provide our teachers with on-site professional learning opportunities; as well as encourage to use district resources to gain professional development outside of our campus. Our Literacy Coach, Graduation Coach, and Literacy Interventionist are crucial staff members who increase the quality of our academic program. We do fund additional opportunities for teachers to plan during the summer and support new initiatives and requests brought to use from our staff.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Not Applicable

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

All students have access to <https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/> as a resources. We provide counseling through our school counselors and mental health counselors. We host drumbeat in a group counseling setting on campus. We coordinate, when necessary, with Peace River Center. Our teaching staff has participated in Mental Health First Aid training by the state of Florida. Our school counselors train the staff annually on bullying prevention and suicide prevention; as well as how to support students who show signs or report signs of abuse.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

We boast dual enrollment courses through both Polk State College and Southeastern University. Our students are able to stay on campus for these course offerings. We have successful career academies that are increasingly having more students pass industry certifications. Our College and Career events on campus are becoming more frequent and are well-attended during the school days. We have an On the Job Training program available to seniors.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have begun implementing a school wide PBIS model to support our tiered needs. Using the MTSS framework, we structure our students' needs based on their data both academically, with attendance, and with discipline. We hope to fully implement PBIS this school year to further stretch the outreach to those students with the most needs and to use early intervention strategies. We have a team of teachers, an administrator, and the LEA who are spearheading this. Our counseling team and mental health support personnel also play an integral role in ensuring all of our students are served according to their need.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Our school provides Professional Learning every opportunity we get. This includes during staff development times and even optional Learning Labs here on campus. We also encourage teachers to explore all of the professional development opportunities provided by our district.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

not applicable

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes