

Seminole County Public Schools

# Lyman High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lyman High School

865 S RONALD REAGAN BLVD, Longwood, FL 32750

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0431>

## 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.**

Empower the youth of today to innovate tomorrow.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Lyman High School will focus on: 1. Inspiring learning in all students which is focused on building relationships while incorporating Restorative Practices campus-wide. 2. Developing a culture of pride, spirit and community through building relationships. 3. Fostering a safe, academically supportive and inclusive environment. 4. Creating a campus of innovation utilizing cross-curricular learning tasks. 5. Encouraging students to "Get Involved" in the plethora of extra-curricular activities offered at Lyman High School.

### 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
Hunter, Michael	Principal	Principal of Lyman High School
Cotter, Faith	Assistant Principal	CTE, Science, Academy of Engineering, ROTC, Graduation Coordinator, Industry Certifications, Professional Development/PLC Coordinator, Open House Coordinator
Skipper, Suzanne	Assistant Principal	ELA, ESOL, Reading, Social Studies, SAC, Summer School Coordinator, Curriculum Leaders, Testing, New Teacher/NEST Program Coordinator, 5Essentials/Snapshot Survey
Walker, Jesse	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Math, Fine Arts, Student Services, Teacher Certification, Registration
Cammack, Mark	Assistant Principal	ESE, PE, Athletics, Alumni Relations, World Languages, Discipline, Threat Assessment Team
Davis, Samuel	Dean	Discipline, PBS, Title IX Coordinator, Hope Scholarship, Truancy Liaison, MTSS
Longarzo, Stephen	Administrative Support	Facilities, Custodial, Emergency Response Plans, Facilitron, Safety & Security
Robinson, Ramsey	Administrative Support	Discipline, Camp Expedition, Transportation, Hope Scholarship, Mentoring Program
Rogers, Ryan	School Counselor	Director of Student Services, Accelerated Opportunities, Registration, National Merit
Burns, Carly	Other	Athletic coach supervision, student assistants, field maintenance coordinator, Duty calendar, FHSA Compliance
Rogers, Theresa	Administrative Support	Media Center, Social Media, Textbooks, Insignia/LibBib

### 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 Curriculum Leaders, SAC and PTSA are provided with the rough draft to discuss and provide viable feedback. The SAC will review the supplied rough draft of the document at the August SAC meeting to provide feedback prior to submitting for an approval vote due in October.

**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))

Intentional support will be offered by the ESE Support Facilitators, ESE Monitor teachers and review of prior assessment data, current progress monitors will be reviewed during the data review meetings conducted with the Reading team, ELA PLCs, Instructional Coach (Newman) and Assistant Principal (Skipper). Instructional Coach (Newman) will provide data feedback regarding progress monitoring, Achieve (Lexile growth, time spent on articles and number of activities completed). Both ELA and Reading shall meet as a PLC to provide scaffolding of district frameworks and adherence to engaging instructional practices.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	59%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	56%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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*	51	55	50	55	57	51	50		
ELA Learning Gains				54			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			32		
Math Achievement*	33	39	38	37	40	38	37		
Math Learning Gains				38			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			19		
Science Achievement*	63	69	64	69	48	40	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	66	70	66	64	51	48	66		
Middle School Acceleration					48	44			
Graduation Rate	94	94	89	97	70	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	62	60	65	65	71	67	59		
ELP Progress	43	59	45	67			49		

*\* 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	625
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
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	38	Yes	4	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	42			
HSP	56			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	52			

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	3	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	42			
HSP	55			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	51			

### 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	51			33			63	66		94	62	43
SWD	18			15			41	34		24	6	
ELL	23			19			39	23		56	7	43
AMI												
ASN	63			52			84	79		95	6	
BLK	32			16			41	42		30	6	
HSP	43			33			58	59		65	7	42
MUL	60			33			60	59		55	6	
PAC												
WHT	63			45			76	81		69	6	
FRL	41			26			54	55		50	7	43

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	55	54	41	37	38	38	69	64		97	65	67
SWD	21	44	38	15	25	28	26	28		90	31	
ELL	30	37	28	21	31	45	44	44		100	65	67
AMI												
ASN	78	70		69	42		83	100		95	83	
BLK	34	43	36	24	39	40	45	28		97	29	
HSP	51	52	42	31	34	40	64	56		98	70	69
MUL	58	54		54	43		78	65		100	57	
PAC												
WHT	64	57	44	48	43	37	80	75		97	72	64
FRL	46	52	40	29	35	36	55	51		96	53	67

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	44	32	37	26	19	60	66		97	59	49
SWD	16	34	28	18	20	16	23	31		97	19	
ELL	19	55	51	25	39	29	17	24		97	63	49
AMI												
ASN	93	70		70	60		94	86		100	86	
BLK	23	29	32	19	15	15	30	44		94	32	
HSP	43	44	40	29	24	16	52	65		97	55	57
MUL	50	30		26	18		47	71		100	63	
PAC												
WHT	62	49	29	52	33	22	74	72		98	69	39
FRL	37	38	34	28	23	17	47	58		95	44	47

### 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	53%	55%	-2%	50%	3%
09	2023 - Spring	46%	54%	-8%	48%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	54%	-35%	50%	-31%

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	60%	68%	-8%	63%	-3%

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.**

Scores for Students with Disabilities, Minority and Economically Disadvantaged

Provide training on new Math Foundations program and monitor the fidelity to which the program is implemented.

Fully include Support Facilitators in Algebra 1 PLC. Monitor PLC meeting participation.

Closely monitor the learning gains of level 2 students. Have PLC provide quarterly corrective actions to improve Level 2 learning gains.

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

ELA Level 3 Grade 9-2022-55%, 2023-46% -9% Algebra I Level 3-2022-44%, 2023-36% -9% Biology Level 3-2022-66.7%, 2023-60.2% -6.5% Factors that led to this decline included more scaffolding needed combined with extension activities that correlated to the PMA or progress monitor (Biology, Algebra) data. Specifically, equation solving, contextual learning and reinforcement to ensure attained knowledge.

**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?**

More students were tested and the PLC gained instructional focus.

Closely monitor the learning gains of level 2 students. The Algebra PLC will provide quarterly corrective actions to improve Level 2 learning gains.

**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.**

Improve Algebra I, ELA 9 and ELA 10 FAST, BEST scores Continue to combine PLCs: ELA/Biology (9th grade fluency and engagement) Continue to meet as a Department (ELA and Social Studies) for annotation, writing enhancement Incorporate PSAT/SAT strategies for ELA and Math

### **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. Improve Algebra 1 EOC proficiency with specific focus on SWD performance. Improve from 18% to 25% .Improve ELA 9 proficiency with specific focus on SWD performance. Improve from 47% to 55% .

**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 Hunter (michael\_hunter@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.

Provide training on new Math Foundations program and monitor the fidelity to which the program is implemented. Fully include Support Facilitators in Algebra 1 PLC. Monitor PLC meeting participation. Closely monitor the learning gains of level 2 students. Have PLC provide quarterly corrective actions to improve Level 2 learning gains.

Continual data analysis of the progress monitor assessments, WRITE SCORE data and improvements with curriculum implementation combined with Kagan strategies for student engagement.

**Person Responsible:** Michael Hunter (michael\_hunter@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 Hunter (michael\_hunter@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.

Trusted Adult

1) Bring back Club Day during lunch in the gym 2) Increase number of on-campus coaches 3) Social Media improvement 4) Survey to see why kids don't participate after 5) Specific period focuses on building relationships 6) Increase number of students participating in extra-curricular programs 7) Start the year with Ali's Room open at lunch on Wednesdays

Restorative Practices

Continue with Restorative Practices and train any new employees to Lyman.

**Person Responsible:** Michael Hunter (michael\_hunter@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).