

Seminole County Public Schools

Lake Howell 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lake Howell High School

4200 DIKE RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0551>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

Lake Howell's mission is to educate students in a manner that will inspire, innovate, and impact our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision regarding student success denotes one of future planning, goal setting, and a proactive approach to curriculum planning which clarifies both secondary and postsecondary objectives. Student performance is denoted through the following measurements: graduation rate, college readiness, annual yearly gains, yearly secondary and collegiate testing and assessment, college entry/ acceptance percentages and reduction of remediation.

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
Howard, Michael	Principal	Principal
Keyser, Mia	Assistant Principal	Principal's Designee, Exceptional Student Education, Math, MTSS, Professional Development, New Teachers and Interns, PTSA and SAC, Public Relations/Information Coordinator, Student Recognitions, School Improvement Plan, Professional Learning Communities
Mudd, Kristin	Assistant Principal	AA and Business programs, Dual Enrollment, CTE, NJROTC, Social Studies, Yearbook
Pearson - Welch, Amber	Assistant Principal	English, ESOL, Reading, Fine/Performing Arts, Student Activities, School Calendar, Student Services, Master Schedule, Graduation
Pitters, Marc	Assistant Principal	GOAL, Emergency Management Planning, Science, World Languages, Physical Education, Mental Health Coordinator, PBS, Summer School Principal, Transition, Compact, GOAL
Grace, Linion	Administrative Support	Discipline, Custodial Staff, School Security, Parking, Alternative Placement Transition
Windt, Joseph	Administrative Support	Discipline, Maintenance, Facilities, Construction, Emergency Management Planning, School Resource Officers, Athletics
McLaughlin, Wes	Administrative Support	Discipline, Attendance, Advanced Placement, Orientations
Novella, Rachel	Administrative Support	Testing, Open House, Orientations, Newsletter, Media Center, Technology, Business Partners

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 Lake Howell parents and community members are seen as valued partners. Their input in the school improvement process is extremely important to the faculty and staff at Lake Howell High School. Parent and community members are involved in the development of the School Improvement Plan through interactions in the Parent-Teacher-Student Association, School Advisory Council, Coffee with Counselors, ELL Silverhawk Parent Academy, and the 5 Essentials, Snapshot, and Safety Surveys.

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))

1. 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))

Assistant principals, literacy coach, and teachers will meet regularly to monitor the effectiveness and impact of interventions on student learning and achievement. At each meeting, the team will determine what strategies and support are impacting learning and if adjustments in the plan need to be made.

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	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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*	49	55	50	52	57	51	50		
ELA Learning Gains				48			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			50		
Math Achievement*	33	39	38	48	40	38	37		
Math Learning Gains				52			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			30		
Science Achievement*	75	69	64	76	48	40	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	70	66	70	51	48	72		
Middle School Acceleration					48	44			
Graduation Rate	99	94	89	98	70	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	54	60	65	58	71	67	65		
ELP Progress	60	59	45	64			63		

** 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	661
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	98

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	39	Yes	4	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	51			
HSP	57			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	56			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	47			
HSP	55			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	49			33			75	64		99	54	60
SWD	21			14			47	30		24	7	40
ELL	23			18			41	42		51	7	60
AMI												
ASN	68			47			90	71		82	6	
BLK	36			20			60	48		42	6	
HSP	44			30			69	53		43	7	60
MUL	46			38			75	76		58	6	
PAC												
WHT	55			40			82	75		65	6	
FRL	40			27			68	54		47	7	56

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	52	48	42	48	52	53	76	70		98	58	64
SWD	18	26	24	20	34	42	43	45		97	25	20
ELL	25	44	41	36	59	56	43	25		98	46	64
AMI												
ASN	65	56		59	74		91	71		95	86	
BLK	40	43	35	32	37	26	59	57		97	48	
HSP	43	44	39	40	50	52	65	61		99	54	59
MUL	68	67		64	55		94	74		96	64	
PAC												
WHT	58	50	41	61	54	60	86	81		98	61	
FRL	43	44	37	41	49	50	68	62		98	51	58

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	50	51	50	37	35	30	66	72		97	65	63
SWD	24	46	42	25	36	31	42	51		91	32	
ELL	19	52	59	18	36	34	32	41		100	71	63
AMI												
ASN	58	74		50	44		78	92		100	79	
BLK	41	43	33	27	30	18	47	56		92	60	
HSP	38	44	50	24	28	31	55	64		96	60	62
MUL	51	55		45	37		59	87		100	57	
PAC												
WHT	61	56	56	49	41	30	79	80		98	68	
FRL	41	48	47	31	31	30	59	69		95	60	68

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	50%	55%	-5%	50%	0%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	54%	-5%	48%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	54%	-33%	50%	-29%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	44%	53%	-9%	48%	-4%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	68%	5%	63%	10%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	69%	-6%	63%	0%

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.

Grade 10 ELA PM3 (lowest in SCPS) and Algebra 1 EOC (tied for 7th in SCPS) need the most significant support.

Contributing factors to Algebra data include year-long teacher vacancy and in ELA 10 PLC struggled initially and additional supports were added as the year progressed.

New actions will be increased instructional support from assistant principals/literacy coach and increase of relationship with the Department of Teaching and Learning and Assessment and Accountability.

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

Grade 10 ELA PM3 (lowest in SCPS) and Algebra 1 EOC (tied for 7th in SCPS) need the most significant support. Contributing factors to Algebra data include year-long teacher vacancy and in ELA 10 PLC struggled initially and additional supports were added as the year progressed.

New actions will be increased instructional support from assistant principals/literacy coach and increase of relationship with the Department of Teaching and Learning and Assessment and Accountability.

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.

Algebra 1 EOC scores have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students with disabilities.

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

ELA 10 had a 4% growth from the 21-22 school year.

We added the Pre-AP English curriculum to increase rigor and instructional strategies. Testing environment was modeled all year to decrease test anxiety and promote test consistency/familiarity. During 4th quarter we implemented pull-out supports for students identified as level 1 on PM 2.

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

N/A

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

- Continued implementation of Pre-AP English curriculum and strategies.
- Intentional focus on foundational standards in Algebra 1 and Geometry.
- Strategic academic support within the Learning Strategies classes.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities. Increase overall scores for ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 36% to 42%. Increase overall scores for Algebra EOC proficiency for SWD from 36% to 42%

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Howard (michael_howard@scps.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.)

The following evidence-based interventions are available to high schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: CAR-PD, Achieve 3000, Corrective Reading, and Reading Mastery.

Math - The following evidence-based interventions are available to middle schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: DreamBox, Transition to Algebra, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Learning Strategies class will be restructured to include specific ELA skills and standards-based remediation. Pre-AP English 1 & Pre-AP English 2 enrollment will be expanded to include more bubble students. PLC planning will include both ELA and ESE (Learning Strategies) teachers to ensure that effective strategies/skills are being included in instruction and remediation. Student progress will be monitored using FAST PM1/PM2 and C9As, Achieve articles, and classroom assessments.

Algebra Foundations course will be targeted to support specific (heavily tested) standards. Algebra foundational standards will be reinforced during pull-outs within the Learning Strategies classes. Algebra 1/Geometry/Foundations classes will have support facilitation. PLC planning will include both Math and ESE (Learning Strategies) teachers to ensure that effective strategies/skills are being included in instruction and remediation. Student progress will be monitored using STAR and C9As, and classroom assessments.

Person Responsible: Michael Howard (michael_howard@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase 5 Essentials Survey and SCPS Safety Survey results indicating a high degree of trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Howard (michael_howard@scps.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.)

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Roll out school-wide mentorship program focusing on each teacher being a trusted adult for a student and recognizing students that do not have a trusted adult at school. Using the Inter-Club Council, promote opportunities for students to join clubs/sports/activities. Use social media (monthly) to spotlight different opportunities for students to join clubs/sports, etc.

Administration will communicate behavior expectations to all students at the beginning of the year during class meetings, Announcements, and Social Media. An additional full-time school safety officer and

discipline dean will be hired. School-wide implementation of Minga Campus Management Platform to monitor skipping and tardies. Security and administration will increase monitoring bathrooms and hallways.

Person Responsible: Michael Howard (michael_howard@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

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).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).