

Seminole County Public Schools

Winter Springs 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

Winter Springs High School

130 TUSKAWILLA RD, Winter Springs, FL 32708

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0911>

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.

Our community's mission is to create productive global citizens who cultivate intercultural understanding, respect for humankind, and a commitment to lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bears Building Integrity through Empathy, Honesty and Perseverance.

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
Gaffney, Peter	Principal	Oversees all aspects of the school.
Bevan, Kenny	Assistant Principal	
Carpenter, Kejuana	Assistant Principal	Student Services, ESE, Principal Designee, Master Scheduler, Discipline, Title IX Coordinator, PBIS, MTSS, College and Career Acceleration
Oliver, Thomas	Assistant Principal	Math, CTE, PE, JROTC. Operation Graduation, Testing Coordinator Supervision, Athletics Supervision, S.A.C.
Sutton, Arika	Assistant Principal	ELA, Reading, ESOL, Science, IB Administrator, Professional Development, Graduation, Young Men and Young Women of Excellence
Hesselbart, Matt	Administrative Support	Director of Facilities, Supervision Assignments, School Safety Guards, School Safety / Fire Drills / Code Red, Rental Contracts, Alumni Coordinator
Clark, Octavius	Dean	10th and 11th Grade Discipline, Transportation, Expulsion Packets, Liaison to Journeys, Detention / InSchool Suspension, Lockers, Bullying Contact, Student Code of Conduct
Collins, Angel	Administrative Support	9th and 12th Grade Discipline, MTSS Behavior / Tardy Support, Student Activities, Athletics Academic Support Liaison, Honor Roll, Juvenile Justice Notification, Senior Class Support, Graduation Support, Awards Night
Gomrad, Scott	Other	Athletics budget and fundraising, coach coordination, Wellness Coordinator
Dunaye, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Promote literacy achievement across all grade levels
Brosch, Kathy	Other	Curriculum Technology Resource and Support
Brevoort, Sarah	Other	Coordination of state and local assessments.
McBryde, Marsha	School Counselor	Coordination of counselors and the Student Services Department.

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.

WSHS, through the 5 Essentials Survey, gains input from the community on how to continually improve the school. The plan will be shared with stakeholders through the school website, the Bear Necessities newsletter (mailing), and the School Advisory Council as well as the P.T.S.A.

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 literacy teams and administrators will meet regularly (monthly and after P.M. Assessments) to review data from Progress Monitoring assessments.
- The team will review relevant student achievement and recommend instructional strategies to address specific skill deficits.

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	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
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*	56	55	50	52	57	51	56		
ELA Learning Gains				49			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			42		
Math Achievement*	38	39	38	50	40	38	43		
Math Learning Gains				58			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			34		
Science Achievement*	63	69	64	62	48	40	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	70	66	68	51	48	71		
Middle School Acceleration					48	44			
Graduation Rate	96	94	89	97	70	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	58	60	65	61	71	67	65		
ELP Progress	52	59	45	69			71		

** 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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

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	663
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94
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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	48			
HSP	53			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	70			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	50			
HSP	54			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	54			

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	56			38			63	65		96	58	52
SWD	21			17			33	26		28	6	
ELL	32			21			30	27		56	7	52
AMI												
ASN	75			70			89	90		88	6	
BLK	39			28			47	51		32	6	
HSP	46			29			53	46		51	7	54
MUL	56			51			61	76		44	6	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	64			45			73	75		66	6	
FRL	43			28			50	48		41	7	49

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	49	41	50	58	56	62	68		97	61	69
SWD	13	29	29	25	46	45	21	32		81	14	
ELL	25	41	39	18	30		42	15		97	45	69
AMI												
ASN	84	67		73	58		86	84		100	92	
BLK	36	46	52	39	56	53	50	43		91	30	
HSP	39	44	39	41	49	50	55	59		97	53	73
MUL	65	50		59	56		71	58				
PAC												
WHT	59	50	37	57	66	66	66	82		98	68	
FRL	38	44	41	39	53	55	50	56		95	49	70

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	56	53	42	43	39	34	68	71		97	65	71
SWD	12	32	36	22	38	43	28	33		83	24	
ELL	24	44	45	33	41	30	39	37		100	50	71
AMI												
ASN	78	65		69			80	83		100	100	
BLK	28	38	30	15	26	20	42	40		90	42	
HSP	44	46	43	37	36	37	53	62		98	59	72
MUL	70	62		43	50		79	64		94	47	
PAC												
WHT	63	58	47	53	43	33	79	80		97	71	
FRL	40	43	38	33	36	32	51	58		95	54	71

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	55%	55%	0%	50%	5%
09	2023 - Spring	55%	54%	1%	48%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	54%	-20%	50%	-16%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	53%	-11%	48%	-6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	68%	-6%	63%	-1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	69%	-5%	63%	1%

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.

Geometry EOC proficiency

Foundational literacy and math skills when entering high school are lower than expected.

Addition of a literacy coach to collect and disaggregate data for teachers, and to provide professional development and strategies to teachers.

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

Geometry achievement dropped from 61.5% to 42.4%. b. Factors include:

- i. Lack of depth in implementation of MTR standards
- ii. Loss of math course that bridged skills gap between Algebra I and Geometry
- iii. Loss of instructional momentum due to staffing issues

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.

Geometry 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?

Algebra I
ELA 9 and ELA 10

Strong PLC's
Commitment to established frameworks.

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.

- a. Identifying students with for targeted interventions at each tier.
- b. Ensure interventions align with standards based instructional practices.
- c. Literacy team will meet regularly to collect data and monitor students' instructional needs.

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 ELA proficiency from 55% to 57%. Increase Geometry proficiency from 42% to 50%

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:

Peter Gaffney (peter_gaffney@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.

ELA

The Literacy coach will identify areas of need and provides strategies and supports to the ELA grade level PLC's

Support Facilitators will have common plan to participate in PLC's

Teachers will develop targeted interventions for students at each tier.

Ensure interventions align with standards based instructional practices.

Literacy team will meet regularly to collect data and monitor students' instructional needs.

Math

Weekly PLC meetings that include review of data from formative and summative assessments

Identify SWD's for teachers so that they are closely monitoring their progress

Common planning period for Support Facilitators to collaborate with Geometry PLC

Provide students with tutoring after school throughout the year.

Provide boost camp prior to the F.A.S.T. Assessment to improve chances for student proficiency

Person Responsible: Peter Gaffney (peter_gaffney@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:

Peter Gaffney (peter_gaffney@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.

Implementation of the WSHS Bear Connection Mentoring Program- 10.44% of WSHS students report that they do not have a trusted adult to talk to on campus.

Pair targeted students with a designated mentor to meet with them on a monthly basis as well as regular "check and connect" moments.

Implementation of Ali's Hope program

PLC commitment to relationship building practices embedded into weekly lessons.

Reduce the number of bathroom related incidents by 15%.

Frequent restroom walkthroughs

Continue vaping awareness education efforts.

Grade level assemblies to address behaviors.

Person Responsible: Peter Gaffney (peter_gaffney@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: On going 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).