

Manatee County Public Schools

GILBERT W MCNEAL ELEM SCHOOL



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 3

 A. School Mission and Vision 3

 B. School Leadership Team 3

 C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 7

 D. Demographic Data 8

 E. Early Warning Systems 9

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 12

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 13

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 14

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 15

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 18

 E. Grade Level Data Review 21

III. Planning for Improvement 22

IV. Positive Culture and Environment 29

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 32

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 34

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 35

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on Original date for School Board approval 10/8/24 - Rescheduled due to Hurricane. School Board approved 10/22/24.

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) |
| <p>A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 parents), 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://cims2.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) | |
| I.E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II.A-E: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| V: 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. The printed version in CIMS represents the SIP as of the "Printed" date listed in the footer.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Gilbert W. McNeal Elementary promotes action-minded leaders by setting goals and embedding the seven habits of happy kids every day.

Our mantra is: I will be respectful, I will be responsible, and I will be wild about learning. We have integrated technology in every aspect of instruction. We are continuing our work in empowering leadership and strengthening our school culture and climate. We will continue our "Leader In Me" Lighthouse journey with continued training during the 2024-2025 school year. These last 7 years we embarked on the 7 Habits of Happy Kids by Sean Covey to enhance our school climate and culture. We strive to empower our students as they will become McNeal Wildcat Leaders and utilize Data Binders and participate in creating action teams and write Wildly Important Goals (WIGS).

Provide the school's vision statement

Vision Statement: Wildcats Lead With Excellence by using leadership habits, critical-thinking skills and problem-solving methods to make a difference in the world.

Gilbert W. McNeal is a STEAM school where integration of Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math are a focus. Our Mantra is: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be WILD about Learning! We are in our eighth year as a Leader In Me School and our second year as a Lighthouse Accredited school during the 2024-2025 school year. We will continue to Shine Bright as a Lighthouse school in all that we do within our school community and reaching beyond our community through our service projects.

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Sheila Waid

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The role of the principal is to influence two fundamental goals: increase student achievement and student safety.

The principal manages the Instructional Leadership Team, budgets the instructional, and cultural resources, analyzes class, and grade level data, and conducts purposeful instructional walks to ensure fidelity.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Jennifer McManis

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The role of the assistant principal is to influence two fundamental goals: increase student achievement and student safety.

The assistant principal analyzes class, and grade level data. Further, the AP conducts purposeful instructional walks to ensure fidelity.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Lillian Matazinski

Position Title

Student Support Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The role of the Student Support Specialist is to monitor and gather school discipline data as well as support staff for any student discipline issues. She supports our students by forming relationships with them and advocating for them, so that they may be successful in the classroom.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Alex Padgett

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The role of the school counselor is to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 students and to disseminate school-wide data to the team in partnership with administration.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Amy Jendro

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The role of the school counselor is to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 students and to disseminate school-wide data to the team in partnership with administration.

The school counselor supports students and teachers with state mandated testing.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Lora Sevarino

Position Title

Media Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Media Specialist works as a collaborator, change agent, and leader to ensure that students and staff are effective users of ideas and information. The Media Specialist will also work with administrators and teachers to collect and analyze data, interpret, and use it to guide instructional decisions.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Dawn Schmid

Position Title

Teacher/Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Reading Coach will support all K-5 teachers in the implementation of the site reading plan and program. The teacher and reading coach will work directly with teachers, providing classroom-based demonstrations, collaborative and one-on-one support, as well as facilitating teacher inquiry and related professional development. The teacher/ reading coach will focus on enhancing teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement in the ownership of learning. The teacher/reading coach will also work with administrators and teachers to collect and analyze data, interpret, and use it to guide instructional decisions.

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

In May 2024, we sent three different surveys: one each to students, parents, and staff to collect information about their priorities, viewpoints, concerns, etc.

We discuss monthly with our stakeholders our goals for our school improvement plan and we discuss our results as we are working towards our goals throughout the school year.

Teachers and staff give their input for our School Improvement Plan during our Instructional Leadership Team meetings as well as our team and staff meetings. We have monthly data chats with grade level teams to review data and analyze how we are progressing towards meeting our SIP goals.

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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESEA 1114(b)(3))

McNeal Elementary School's School Improvement Plan will be monitored through informal walks, formal observations, as well as monthly data meetings with grade level teams. District Benchmark measurements, PM 1, 2, and 3 assessments provide additional data points to review and analyze. Stakeholders will be updated monthly during the scheduled SAC meetings.

D. Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE) | ACTIVE |
| SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE) | ELEMENTARY PK-5 |
| PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE) | K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION |
| 2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS | NO |
| 2023-24 MINORITY RATE | 27.8% |
| 2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE | 25.9% |
| CHARTER SCHOOL | NO |
| RAISE SCHOOL | NO |
| 2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024 | N/A |
| ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG) | |
| 2023-24 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) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL) |
| SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i> | 2023-24: A 2022-23: A* 2021-22: A 2020-21: 2019-20: |

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 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 school days | 13 | 13 | 12 | 9 | 15 | 14 | | | | 76 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | | | | 11 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 12 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 1 | 8 | | | | 74 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 33 | 11 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 9 | | | | 80 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | 2 | 3 | 15 | 7 | | | | | | 27 |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4) | | | | | | | | | | 0 |

Current Year 2024-25

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 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | | | 24 |

Current Year 2024-25

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

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained students: current year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 |

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last 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 school days | 16 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 19 | 12 | | | | 82 |
| One or more suspensions | | 7 | 3 | | | 6 | | | | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | | | | 5 | 12 | | | | | 17 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | | | | 2 | 10 | | | | | 12 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | 17 |

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 2 |

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained students: current year | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | | | | | | | | | | 0 |

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT | 2024 | | | 2023 | | | 2022** | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† |
| ELA Achievement * | 79 | 55 | 57 | 74 | 51 | 53 | 80 | 55 | 56 |
| ELA Grade 3 Achievement ** | 82 | 55 | 58 | 78 | 51 | 53 | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 71 | 60 | 60 | | | | 63 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% | 65 | 58 | 57 | | | | 44 | | |
| Math Achievement * | 86 | 66 | 62 | 80 | 62 | 59 | 80 | 50 | 50 |
| Math Learning Gains | 76 | 63 | 62 | | | | 74 | | |
| Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% | 63 | 51 | 52 | | | | 54 | | |
| Science Achievement * | 83 | 54 | 57 | 77 | 51 | 54 | 71 | 65 | 59 |
| Social Studies Achievement * | | | | | | | | 66 | 64 |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | 52 | 50 |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | 51 | 52 |
| College and Career Readiness | | | | | | | | | 80 |
| ELP Progress | 70 | 61 | 61 | 46 | 59 | 59 | 83 | | |

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2023-24 ESSA FPPI | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students | 75% |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI | 675 |
| Total Components for the FPPI | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Graduation Rate | |

| ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|
| 2023-24 | 2022-23 | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20* | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| 75% | 74% | 69% | 75% | | 68% | 67% |

* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2023-24 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% |
| Students With Disabilities | 50% | No | | |
| English Language Learners | 81% | No | | |
| Hispanic Students | 78% | No | | |
| Multiracial Students | 79% | No | | |
| White Students | 76% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 70% | No | | |
| 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% |
| Students With Disabilities | 48% | No | | |
| English | 46% | No | | |

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% |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Language Learners | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | 47% | No | | |
| Hispanic Students | 81% | No | | |
| Multiracial Students | 81% | No | | |
| White Students | 77% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 64% | No | | |

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% |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities | 51% | No | | |
| English Language Learners | 78% | No | | |

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% |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Native American Students | | | | |
| Asian Students | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | 52% | No | | |
| Hispanic Students | 76% | No | | |
| Multiracial Students | 73% | No | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | |
| White Students | 67% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 50% | No | | |

D. 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)

| 2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | GRAD RATE 2022-23 | C&C ACCEL 2022-23 | ELP PROGRESS |
| All Students | 79% | 82% | 71% | 65% | 86% | 76% | 63% | 83% | | | | | 70% |
| Students With Disabilities | 46% | 50% | 56% | 44% | 52% | 64% | 50% | 40% | | | | | |
| English Language Learners | 82% | | | | 91% | | | | | | | | 70% |
| Hispanic Students | 87% | 95% | 76% | | 85% | 70% | 60% | 73% | | | | | |
| Multiracial Students | 69% | | 80% | | 88% | 80% | | | | | | | |
| White Students | 80% | 82% | 70% | 59% | 87% | 77% | 64% | 87% | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 64% | 62% | 72% | 74% | 75% | 78% | 68% | 69% | | | | | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 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 | 74% | 78% | | | 80% | | | 77% | | | | | 46% |
| Students With Disabilities | 50% | 55% | | | 50% | | | 37% | | | | | |
| English Language Learners | 25% | | | | 50% | | | | | | | | 62% |
| Black/African American Students | 43% | | | | 50% | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | 79% | 94% | | | 85% | | | 67% | | | | | |
| Multiracial Students | 81% | | | | 81% | | | | | | | | |
| White Students | 75% | 74% | | | 80% | | | 80% | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 65% | 64% | | | 65% | | | 61% | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. |
| All Students | 80% | | 63% | 44% | 80% | 74% | 54% | 71% | | |
| Students With Disabilities | 50% | | 42% | 26% | 59% | 71% | 58% | 50% | | |
| English Language Learners | 67% | | 82% | | 75% | 82% | | | | 83% |
| Native American Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | 42% | | 44% | | 54% | 69% | 50% | 50% | | |
| Hispanic Students | 85% | | 72% | | 77% | 76% | | 70% | | |
| Multiracial Students | 69% | | | | 77% | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| White Students | 83% | | 63% | 41% | 83% | 73% | 52% | 72% | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 63% | | 56% | 38% | 58% | 53% | 35% | 47% | | |

E. 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.

| 2023-24 SPRING | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------------|-------|----------------|
| SUBJECT | GRADE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | SCHOOL - DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL - STATE |
| Ela | 3 | 81% | 51% | 30% | 55% | 26% |
| Ela | 4 | 70% | 52% | 18% | 53% | 17% |
| Ela | 5 | 83% | 51% | 32% | 55% | 28% |
| Math | 3 | 91% | 63% | 28% | 60% | 31% |
| Math | 4 | 71% | 62% | 9% | 58% | 13% |
| Math | 5 | 89% | 60% | 29% | 56% | 33% |
| Science | 5 | 84% | 49% | 35% | 53% | 31% |

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Most Improvement

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

Our greatest improvement was with 5th grade Science. Additionally, the Math achievement, learning gains, and lowest 25 LG scores improved as well. The admin team conducted focused walks during Science, Reading and Math along with taking the time to analyze and provide important information and immediate feedback. Our team collaborated and utilized the feedback to improve classroom instruction and environments. We aligned data with our walks as well as observations. We also used a new schedule for the 23-24 school year which allowed for less loss of instruction time and more direct instruction as well as the ability for teachers to become "experts" in their subject area.

Lowest Performance

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Proficiency with our Students with Disabilities:

SWD's in ELA 46% (Goal is 50%)

SWD's in Math 52% (Goal is 55%)

SWD's in Science 44% (Goal is 48%)

A contributing factor is that we started the school year in 4th Grade with a 21% ESE resource student population. Due to various factors beyond our control, the ESE student population in 4th Grade increased to 24% (as measured at the end of the school year). Furthermore, behavior issues in 4th grade, which included 5 new students with behavior challenges including one student with RBT and one student with a one-on-one aid, presented staff with trials and difficulties and took time to sort out. Various strategies were utilized to counteract this trend such as teaching expectations, working with parents, behavior intervention plans, and referral to the IST. However, since these students were added during the year, the duration of the interventions were not long enough to improve the academics and test scores.

Greatest Decline

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

Our 4th grade proficiency for ELA and Math was our greatest decline, with math only being a 71 and ELA a 70. A contributing factor is that we started the school year in 4th Grade with a 21% ESE resource student population. Due to various factors beyond our control, the ESE student population in 4th Grade increased to 24% (as measured at the end of the school year). Furthermore, behavior issues in 4th grade, which included 5 new students with behavior challenges including one student with RBT and one student with a one-on-one aid, presented staff with trials and difficulties and took time to sort out. Various strategies were utilized to counteract this trend such as teaching expectations, working with parents, behavior intervention plans, and referral to the IST. However, since these students were added during the year, the duration of the interventions were not long enough to improve the academics and test scores.

Greatest Gap

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.

We did not have any gaps when compared to the state average.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

One area of concern for us is the "Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency for grades K-3". We went from 17 to 27 with the largest gap being with our 2nd graders. We will focus and dig deep into 1st grade students this year to find out what factors may be contributing to this gap.

Highest Priorities

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

Overall Proficiency & Learning Gains for our students with disabilities

- Increase ELA proficiency & LG.
- Increase MATH proficiency & LG.
- Increase Science proficiency & LG.

Closely monitor the K-2 data to be sure our gap closes for "Substantial Reading Deficiency".

Improve the culture of our school encouraging attendance and improving behavior by using CHAMPS.

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

One area of focus will be to improve the instructional practice of teachers specifically relating to student engagement.

Research data shows that emphasis on best instructional practices specifically relating to student engagement promotes positive outcomes for students and teachers such as higher productivity, lower absenteeism, higher quality work, and higher job satisfaction. An example of a best instructional practice to increase student engagement is the implementation of "Building Thinking Classrooms in Mathematics" initiative.

This approach encourages students to do the work themselves, enhancing their understanding and engagement. Students can independently verify their work by providing answers and later worked solutions. This method fosters a more thoughtful approach to learning and aligns with the goal of McNeal's School Improvement Plan.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

90% of students in grades 3-5 will be exposed to best instructional practices relating to student engagement and will increase their Math Learning Gains from 76% to 77%.

Additionally, staff will collect qualitative data in the classroom via observational methods.

Administration will collect student engagement data via informal and formal classroom observations. Furthermore, 80% of students will participate in a student self-report survey to report on the quality and frequency of their own involvement in the classroom instruction.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Administration will monitor student engagement during informal and formal classroom walks during the school year. Teachers and staff will assist in encouraging student engagement and will monitor student tasks in the classroom. Administration will complete fidelity checks for best instructional strategies relating to student engagement and will monitor data monthly during the grade level data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Sheila Waid, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

We will use Peter Liljedahl's 'Building Thinking Classrooms in Mathematics' to present teachers with 14 optimal practices for thinking that create an ideal setting for deep mathematics learning and increased student engagement. Teachers often find it difficult to implement lessons that help students go beyond rote memorization and repetitive calculations. Peter Liljedahl's best instructional practice as outlined in 'Building Thinking Classrooms in Mathematics,' gives teachers practical and powerful ways to encourage their students to engage deeply with mathematical concepts and improve students' thinking as well as analysis capabilities.

Rationale:

Targeting best instructional practices specifically relating to student engagement creates focus and purpose for teachers. Outcomes of observations and collaborative conversations with teachers and teacher leaders will inform about challenges and ways to assist in the implementation of the Peter Liljedahl's method. The ultimate goal is to improve students' engagement and understanding of fundamental mathematical concepts to create a solid foundation as they move from grade level to grade level and beyond.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Look Fors developed for Walks

Person Monitoring:

Sheila Waid, Principal

By When/Frequency:

May 2024/monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Define Look Fors related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of the students. Create and use systems for monitoring Look Fors to strengthen alignment of daily instructional tasks to grade level benchmarks and ensure fidelity use of instructional resources and best instructional practices. Facilitated and collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of best instructional practices relating to student engagement. Targeted professional development, weekly collaborative planning will further improve teachers' expertise and knowledge.

Action Step #2

Book Study on "Building Thinking Classrooms" School Wide

Person Monitoring:

Sheila Waid, Principal

By When/Frequency:

May 2024/monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

2 of our teachers - one primary and one intermediate are attending the District Book Study for "Building Thinking Classrooms". These teachers are bringing back the information to share in the small groups with the Primary Teachers and the Intermediate teachers. Teachers will be able to share ideas of how they are implementing these instructional practices in their classrooms and share success stories. During our Data Chats monthly we will be able to discuss the data to analyze if the implementation is making a difference.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

The area of focus was determined from analyzing many data pieces, but specifically last year's State FAST Data. We need to increase our proficiency in all subject areas for ALL students but specifically or ESE and by increasing our proficiency our Learning Gains will naturally increase.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

If our instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then ELA, Math, and Science proficiency and learning gains will increase by 5% or more as measured by 2025 Spring FAST. This expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level and for each ESSA subgroup to meet or exceed 41% proficiency. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Sheila Waid, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Florida's Multi Tiered System of Support

Rationale:

An effective MTSS framework has the following components: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved learning outcomes.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Define Look Fors

Person Monitoring:

Sheila Waid, Principal

By When/Frequency:

May of 2025

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Define Look Fors related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of every student. Create and use systems for monitoring Look Fors to strengthen alignment of daily instructional tasks to grade level benchmarks, ensure fidelity use of instructional resources for remedial and intervention instruction, and utilize strategies to engage all students.

Action Step #2

Meeting structures for the year

Person Monitoring:

Sheila Waid, Principal

By When/Frequency:

May of 2025

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures (ILT, TCT, PLC, and IST) to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address their unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to students' needs.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

No Answer Entered

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

No Answer Entered

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

No Answer Entered

Person responsible for monitoring outcome**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:**Rationale:****Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:****Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1**Person Monitoring:****By When/Frequency:**

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

ELL subgroup - We have 41 countries represented within our population, which means that our students were born in 41 different countries. Therefore, we have many different languages spoken from our very diverse populations. Currently we have 15 different languages spoken fluently within our school. We celebrate this diversity each year for Heritage Day and we must be sure that our ELL students are progressing in their academics as well as socially and emotionally. We have a diverse staff population as well and wish to continue using our staff to mentor this population of students.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

We want 90% of our ELL students to participate in our Heritage Day / Leadership Day activities this year by sharing their culture during our programs throughout the school year. Our staff will mentor this population and continue to invest their time sharing with these students to support them in all they do in our school community. This is beneficial to our staff/teachers as well as our students. We also wish for our ELL population to increase their proficiency in Math and ELA to 75%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Administration will monitor the students participating in the school wide events during the school year. Teachers and staff will help to encourage participation by all ELL students. Administration will monitor the staff/teachers mentoring these students and support where it is needed.

Administration will complete fidelity checks for ELL strategies through focus based walks and / or observations.

We will monitor data monthly during our grade level data chats.

Administration will analyze Lexia results ensuring ELL students minutes are met and growth is occurring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Sheila Waid

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

We will use a Focus Based strategy learned in the Brian Dasslar Leadership Academy before any walks or observations specifically looking for ELL strategies being used to assist students. The foundational ideas are based on common language for high quality instruction and knowing how to lead for that. There are four dimensions of instructional leadership: Vision/Mission, Improvement of Instructional Practice, Allocation of Resources, and Management of systems and processes. We will monitor the Lexia program and be sure that students are using this researched based program with fidelity.

Rationale:

Targeted feedback cycles create purpose such as: focus and creates outcomes for observations and conversations. Teacher and leader work together to decide when evidence is related to area of focus. Feedback is based on collaborative conversations with instruction and student learning as the context with factual feedback - (what you see and what you hear). We also invested in the training in Orton-Gillingham with 7 of our grade level teachers this past year. We plan to train 4 more teachers during this school year. We also invested in training 5 staff members on SIPPS and purchasing 3 more SIPP kits for grade levels to use during Tiered intervention time - WIN (What I Need).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:**Action Step #1**

Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:

Sheila Waid

By When/Frequency:

May 2025 / monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor required of the benchmarks and to plan instructional task that engage all students. Weekly collaborative planning will also address remedial and accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data.

Action Step #2

Look Fors

Person Monitoring:

Sheila Waid

By When/Frequency:

May 2025 / Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

2. Define Look Fors related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of every student. Create and use systems for monitoring Look Fors to strengthen alignment of daily instructional tasks to grade level benchmarks, ensure fidelity use of instructional resources for remedial and intervention instruction, and utilize strategies to engage all students.

Action Step #3

Identify Instructional Practices

Person Monitoring:

Sheila Waid

By When/Frequency:

May 2025 / Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

3. Identify the instructional practice(s) that will increase teacher capacity and create a plan for coaching to accelerate improvement. Create systems for monitoring the focus, frequency, and types of coaching and support for improved teaching and learning.

Action Step #4

Meeting Structures

Person Monitoring:

Sheila Waid

By When/Frequency:

May 2025 / Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

4. Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures (ILT, TCT, PLC, and IST) to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address their unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to students' needs.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

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

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)ii))

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

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). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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 ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

| BUDGET | ACTIVITY | FUNCTION/ OBJECT | FUNDING SOURCE | FTE | AMOUNT |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|-----|--------|
| Plan Budget Total | | | | | 0.00 |