Volusia County Schools

BLUE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 2

A. School Mission and Vision 2

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2

C. Demographic Data 6

D. Early Warning Systems 7

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 14

E. Grade Level Data Review 17

III. Planning for Improvement 18

IV. Positive Learning Environment 27

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 29

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 33

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 35

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state’s graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Blue Lake Elementary School provides a nurturing and challenging student-centered educational environment that inspires academic excellence and critical thinking skills to empower students to reach their full potential in a diverse and dynamic world.

Provide the school's vision statement

Create life-long learners prepared for an ever-changing global society.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

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

Holly Bailey

hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To oversee the day to day operation of the school, including but not limited to, implementation of MTSS, weekly PLC meetings with data analysis, ensuring the safety and security of the campus, monitoring the MTSS process and early warning systems, and monitoring progress towards SIP Goals.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Cheryl Selesky

caselesk@volusia.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists principal with overseeing day operation of the school, including but not limited to, implementation of MTSS, weekly PLC meetings with data analysis, ensuring the safety and security of the campus, monitoring the MTSS process and early warning systems, and monitoring progress towards SIP Goals.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Sarah Fogle

shfogle@volusia.k12.fl.us

Position Title
ESE Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Dylan Campbell

dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Math/Science Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To provide professional learning opportunities and classroom support for teachers to facilitate improvement in the delivery and effectiveness of instruction in the critical areas of education that will enhance teacher quality and effectiveness to foster increased student achievement for all students

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Danyel Hoskins

dbhoskin@volusia.k12.fl.us

Position Title
ELA Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To provide professional learning opportunities and classroom support for teachers to facilitate improvement in the delivery and effectiveness of instruction in the critical areas of education that will enhance teacher quality and effectiveness to foster increased student achievement for all students

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name
Gina Klimas

gmklimas@volusia.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Intermediate Teacher; SAC Chair

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team. In addition, serve as the liaison for all stakeholders; organizes and facilitates the School Advisory Council

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

Our school leadership team met in July to provide input for the SIP. We also meet with our School Advisory Council which includes staff, parents, families, and a community member in August to provide input for the SIP. We provide a week in August for public input as well. Each person that provides input is provided with the school based data from the previous school year to determine the next steps for our SIP.

3. 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The SIP progress will be monitored monthly through state and district assessment data to include the ESSA subgroups. We will meet with our School Leadership Team monthly to monitor the data and revise the SIP as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 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**
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	**YES**
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**100.0%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**YES**
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	**CSI**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)*** **ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)** **BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)** **HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)** **MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)** **WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)** **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)**
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY **2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.*	**2024-25: C** **2023-24: C** **2022-23: C** **2021-22: D** **2020-21:**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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	
School Enrollment	45	68	73	71	80	79				416
Absent 10% or more school days	10	27	26	20	29	20				132
One or more suspensions	1	8	4	3	6	4				26
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	5				6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	9	6				15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	27				46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	26	25				51
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	16	21	11	17	21				88
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

Current Year 2025-26

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	2	16	14	8	23	17				80

Current Year 2025-26

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	2	0	0	0	0	0				2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

Prior Year (2024-25) 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	10	27	27	29	22	25				140
One or more suspensions		3	2	6	4	1				16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				7	9	8				24
Course failure in Math				3	5	6				14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	19	22	28	10	28				109
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	2	31	14	37	15	28				127
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	13	15	25						55
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	2	21	6	18	6					53

Prior Year (2024-25) 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	6	9	8				25

Prior Year (2024-25) 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	2	3		13						18
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

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 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	44	56	59	40	55	57	39	52	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	47	58	59	35	56	58	39	55	53
ELA Learning Gains	58	57	60	53	57	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50	53	56	47	50	57			
Math Achievement*	46	61	64	47	57	62	41	55	59
Math Learning Gains	59	62	63	57	59	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41	50	51	45	46	52			
Science Achievement	58	63	58	48	60	57	40	62	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	68	65	63	62	60	61	25	60	59

*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)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	52%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	471
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	97%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	**2023-24**	**2022-23**	**2021-22**	**2020-21****	**2019-20***	**2018-19**
52%	48%	39%	40%	32%		44%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 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.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 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	24%	Yes	6	5
English Language Learners	43%	No		
Black/African American Students	58%	No		
Hispanic Students	51%	No		
Multiracial Students	50%	No		
White Students	52%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49%	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.

2024-25 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 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	44%	47%	58%	50%	46%	59%	41%	58%					68%
Students With Disabilities	8%	8%	41%	42%	12%	45%	38%	0%					
English Language Learners	25%	27%	44%	40%	37%	65%		38%					68%
Black/African American Students	48%	60%	58%		51%	61%		69%					
Hispanic Students	38%	39%	54%	60%	44%	64%	50%	39%					68%
Multiracial Students	42%				58%								
White Students	49%	52%	65%	50%	44%	52%	30%	72%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	38%	43%	50%	46%	42%	59%	38%	51%					73%

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	40%	35%	53%	47%	47%	57%	45%	48%					62%
Students With Disabilities	13%	6%	38%	30%	13%	35%	38%	27%					40%
English Language Learners	17%		34%	43%	27%	34%	21%	17%					62%
Black/African American Students	23%	14%	33%	40%	29%	56%		31%					
Hispanic Students	40%	50%	48%	47%	43%	52%	38%	33%					63%
Multiracial Students	33%		30%		82%								
White Students	48%	32%	71%		56%	59%		70%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	33%	29%	44%	48%	41%	51%	45%	41%					65%

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	39%	39%			41%			40%					25%
Students With Disabilities	15%	0%			15%			30%					12%
English Language Learners	20%	19%			25%			26%					35%
Black/African American Students	37%	42%			23%			23%					
Hispanic Students	27%	25%			33%			35%					37%
Multiracial Students	33%				50%								
White Students	54%	52%			55%			54%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	35%	34%			35%			37%					36%

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.

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	48%	57%	-9%	57%	-9%
ELA	4	35%	55%	-20%	56%	-21%
ELA	5	51%	56%	-5%	56%	-5%
Math	3	48%	61%	-13%	63%	-15%
Math	4	43%	62%	-19%	62%	-19%
Math	5	49%	57%	-8%	57%	-8%
Science	5	59%	62%	-3%	55%	4%

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?

According to PM3 data, our 3rd grade ELA had the greatest increase in improvement, from 35% to 47%.
Contributing factors: Incoming students' foundational skills were higher from the previous year. Coaching was focused on monitoring implementation of planning and providing on the spot feedback to teachers. Small groups were targeted and created based on student needs identified by specific benchmarks using data analysis.

Lowest Performance

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

According to the PM3 data, our 4th grade ELA data had the lowest performance at 35% proficient. PM1 and PM2 data also demonstrated underperformance in comparison to proficiency in 3rd and 5th grade ELA.
Contributing factors: Our classroom walkthrough data showed a trend in misalignment between instruction and tasks in 4th grade.

According to the PM3 data, our 4th and 5th grade math had the lowest learning gains in the lowest quartile at 41%. PM1 and PM2 data also demonstrated underperformance in comparison to proficiency in 3rd and 5th grade math.
Contributing factors: Our classroom walkthrough data showed a trend in misalignment between instruction and tasks. This was also a district-wide concern for 4th and 5th grade.

Greatest Decline

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

According to the PM3 data, our 4th and 5th grade math had the lowest learning gains in the lowest quartile at 41%. PM1 and PM2 data also demonstrated underperformance in comparison to proficiency in 3rd and 5th grade math.
Contributing factors: Our classroom walkthrough data showed a trend in misalignment between

instruction and tasks. This was also a district-wide concern for 4th and 5th grade. Students lack of knowledge in basic skills was a contributing factor.

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.

According to PM3 data, 4th grade ELA and math had the greatest gap compared to the state. The state average in ELA was 56% proficient and our 4th grade data showed 35% proficient for a deficit of 21%. The state average in math was 62% proficient and our 4th grade data showed 43% proficient for a deficit of 19%.
Resources pulled from curriculum were not always aligned to the grade level content as was evidenced by our classroom walkthrough data and student work analysis from task completion.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Student attendance remains a concern. 28% (149) of our students are missing 10% or more of the school year. This area of concern demonstrates a need to strengthen our MTSS system and problem solving to ensure root causes are identified and targeted.

Highest Priorities

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

The systems identified as needing the most attention on our campus for the upcoming year are:

- Planning
- MTSS/Problem Solving
- Coaching

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 Benchmark-aligned instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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.

2025 data indicated a proficiency level of 44% ELA, 46% math, and 41% lowest quartile learning gains in math. 24% of students with disabilities scored proficient on PM3. Learning gains in the lowest quartile showed the greatest decline from 45% to 41%. The factors that contributed are our math intervention teacher was on medical leave for multiple weeks, large class size for 4th grade due to the inability to find a quality teacher, the 4th grade group came showed larger deficits from the prior year, and teachers need support with benchmark aligned instruction to include small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome

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.

FAST data will reflect a minimum of 55% of students scoring proficient in ELA and Math and making learning gains in the lowest quartile by the end of the year.
FAST data will reflect a minimum of 41% of students with disabilities scoring proficient by the end of the year. These goals are attainable as we have made similar growth in other components.
Administrative walkthroughs will show an increase of 10% growth in the areas of benchmark aligned questioning and task alignment by the end of the year. 2/3 of our teachers in Tier 3 of coaching support will move to Tier 1 or 2 by the end of the school year.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

PM and VBA data will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks after planning has been properly implemented. The data will reflect a minimum of 55% of students scoring proficient in ELA and Math on these assessments. The evidence of implementation will be the review

of lesson plans, PLC minutes, and walkthrough data.

SBLT will monitor target/task alignment through weekly focused classroom walkthroughs using the standard walkthrough tool. Last year's walkthrough data shows that 62% of observed lessons had tasks aligned to the benchmark. If properly implemented we expect to have 75% of observed lessons with tasks that are fully aligned to the benchmark.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Administration and Coaches

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
Providing Professional Development: By providing collaborative planning weekly through intensive teacher professional learning, facilitated by school-based experts (coaches) and designed to deepen content-based learning, support benchmark-aligned instruction and tasks, and build capacity among staff. This will be monitored through lesson plans and PLC minutes.

Rationale:
Research has shown that teacher effectiveness is the most important school-based factor that influences student outcomes, including student achievement. Providing Professional Development is identified as a moderate Tier 2 intervention identified by WWC as evidenced by Impact Results of the eMINTS Professional Development Validation Study: Professional development Validation Study Meyers, Coby V.; Molefe, Ayrin; Brandt, W. Christopher; Zhu, Bo; Dhillon, Sonica (2016). Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, v38 n3 p455-476. Retrieved from : https;//eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1108395

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Common Planning

Person Monitoring:
Administration and Coaching

By When/Frequency:
May 2026/Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Instructional coaches with administration will facilitate weekly grade level planning and provide support on ow to develop benchmark aligned lessons. Provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in

implementation of instructional practices. Coaches will model implementation of instructional frameworks, instructional practices, and utilization of student tasks aligned to benchmarks during planning. Leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Action Step #2
Coaching

Person Monitoring:
Administration

By When/Frequency:
May 2026/Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Coaches will provide content support based on walkthrough data. Evidence of Implementation • Tiered coaching support plan developed with walkthrough trends. • Coaching schedule indicating focus, frequency, and methods of support. • Coaching logs documenting support and next steps Evidence of Impact Trends over time showing: • Improvement in walkthrough data of identified teachers over time • Adjustments to tiering document based on growth in teacher practice. • Principal evaluation noting improvement in identified areas as evidence of coaching impact.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
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.

Kindergarten below grade level: 53% of students based on 2024-2025 STAR Early Literacy PM 3. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Early Literacy PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

First Grade below grade level: 55% of students based on 2024-2025 STAR Reading on PM 3. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Reading on PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

Second Grade below grade level: 48% of students based on 2024-2025 STAR Reading on PM 3.

Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Reading on PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

Third grade below grade level: 55% of students based on the 2025 FAST PM 3 data end of year. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on 2025 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

Fourth grade below grade level: 67% of students based on the 2025 FAST PM 3 data end of year. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on 2025 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

Fifth grade below grade level: 50% of students based on the 2025 FAST PM 3 data end of year. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on 2025 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need

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

Kindergarten below grade level: 53% of students based on 2024-2025 STAR Early Literacy PM 3. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within explicit small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Early Literacy PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

First Grade below grade level: 55% of students based on 2024-2025 STAR Reading on PM 3. Area of

Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within explicit small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Reading on PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

Second Grade below grade level: 48% of students based on 2024-2025 STAR Reading on PM 3. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within explicit small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on STAR Reading on PM 3 and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

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

Third grade below grade level: 55% of students based on the 2025 FAST PM 3 data end of year. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within explicit small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on 2025 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

Fourth grade below grade level: 67% of students based on the 2025 FAST PM 3 data end of year. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within explicit small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on 2025 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need.

Fifth grade below grade level: 50% of students based on the 2025 FAST PM 3 data end of year. Area of Focus: Instructional practice will focus on Tier 1 core instruction and tasks that directly align with state benchmarks within explicit small group instruction. How it affects student learning in literacy: Teachers will leverage collaborative planning with a content expert to best align instruction with state benchmarks. Rationale for critical need: Based on 2025 FAST PM 3 data and district progress monitoring data determined this critical area of need

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

K-2:
Kindergarten 2025 end of year data: 53% below grade level, therefore, 47% were on track to be on grade level by the end of the year. Based on this, we can reasonably anticipate at least 55% of our

current Kindergarteners will be on grade level by the end of the 2026 school year based on Star Early Literacy.

1st grade 2025 end of year data: 55% below grade level, therefore, 45% were on track to be on grade level by the end of year. Based on this, we are aiming for at least 55% of our current 1st graders will be on grade level by the end of the 2026 school year based on Star Reading.

2nd grade 2025 end of year data: 48% below grade level, therefore, 52% were on track to be on grade level by the end of the year. Based on this, we can are aiming for at least 60% of our current 2nd graders will be on grade level by the end of the 2026 school year based on Star Reading.

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

3-5:
We plan on achieving 55% overall proficiency rate in grades 3-5 at Blue Lake in ELA.

3rd grade 2025 end of year FAST PM 3 data: 52% below grade level, therefore, 48% were on grade level. However, 59% of this cohort of students scored on grade level at the end of last year. Based on this, we are aiming for at least 65% of our current 3rd graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on FAST PM 3.

4th grade 2025 end of year FAST PM 3 data: 66% below grade level, therefore, 34% were on grade level. However, 48% of this cohort of students scored on grade level at the end of last year. Based on this, we are aiming for at least 54% of our current 4th graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on FAST PM 3.

5th grade 2025 end of year FAST PM 3 data: 49% below grade level, therefore, 51% were on grade level. However, 34% of this cohort of students scored on grade level at the end of last year. Based on this, we are aiming for at least 45% of our current 5th graders to be on grade level by the end of the year based on FAST PM 3.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

PM data from state assessment platforms and VBA data from the VCS Data Dashboard will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration and Coaches

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
SIPPS instruction in grades K-3 has a systematic scope and sequence approach provides a structured-literacy approach to instruction through explicit routines focused on phonological awareness, spelling sounds, and sight words. i-Ready Tools for Instruction, i-Ready Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension, i-Ready Toolbox is an evidence based strategy used in grades 3rd-5th.

Rationale:
SIPPS instruction in grades K-3: It is based on the premise that beginning literacy is best taught through two distinct strands: one focusing on language comprehension and the other on word recognition. (Moderate Evidence-https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/reading/sippsr-systematic-instructionphonological awareness-phonics-and-sight-words) i-Ready Tools for Instruction, i-Ready Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension, i-Ready Toolbox- Allows for differentiated individualized instruction in grades 3-5 based on benchmark assessments- Promising Evidence, https://www.curriculumassociates.com/readyessa

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Walk to Excellence Schedule

Person Monitoring:
Administration and ELA Coach

By When/Frequency:
May 2026/Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Create a schedule for Walk to Excellence with targeted groupings of students based on their individual reading deficits and/or needs. WTE targeted groupings are revised based on district and state assessment data.

Action Step #2
Coaching

Person Monitoring:
Administration

By When/Frequency:
May 2026/Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
ELA Coach will provide content support based on walkthrough data to ensure the fidelity of the interventions.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

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.

28% of the student population were absent 10% or more of the school year as identified in our EWS data.

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.

Decrease the amount of students who are chronically absent by 10%.

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.

The MTSS chair will monitor attendance monthly. Increased attendance will increase academic achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration and MTSS chair

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

MTSS for attendance.

Rationale:

The use of MTSS process allows for differentiation based on student/family needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
MTSS Attendance

Person Monitoring:
Administration and MTSS Chair

By When/Frequency:
May 2026/Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
The SLT will meet monthly to discuss students with attendance concerns. The SLT will create action plans for each student with chronic attendance. The action plans will be monitored monthly and revised as needed.

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

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

SIP is disseminated at faculty meetings, SAC, the school's website. https://bluelake.vcsedu.org/

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 Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

Communication through school-wide celebrations, PTO sponsored events, open-house, parent/teacher conferences, weekly emails, community business partners, Stetson Professional Development school, Advent Health partnership

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

Title 1 annual meeting, Open House, monthly parent engagement activities, a copy of the SIP will be in the main office for parents to see. We will review the SIP with SAC https://bluelake.vcsedu.org/

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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

To build positive relationships with parents, families and other community/stakeholders, Blue Lake hosts an Open House, monthly parent engagement activities, and provides a Title 1 Compact. We communicate with families through Facebook, the school website, marquee, weekly emails, and phones calls through FOUCS. We inform parents of their child's progress with quarterly progress reports, report cards, parent teacher conferences, etc.

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

We provide small group lessons from our school counselor on an as needed basis. Our school counselor provides community resources to families in need.
Our school counselor facilitates a school wide mentoring program.
We partner with the House Next Door and Halifax Behavioral Services to provide support for our students.

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

N/A

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. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

We implement a PBIS system schoolwide.
We have a House System consisting of four houses for students to participate in and receive incentives.
We implement individual behavior plans for students in need.
We have a TOA that provides small group instruction for identified students.

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV),

ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

We provide common planning weekly for teachers to collaborate.
We provide coaching for all teachers.
We facilitate 6 Early Release Professional Learnings each year.
We analyze data to effectively implement an action plan for intervention and remediation.

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

We offer a kindergarten orientation informational session.
We have 5 early learning programs on campus.

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

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

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

Teachers follow the VCS provided curriculum maps and resources,
Participate in weekly collaborative planning with content experts.
Hold monthly leadership meeting to review ESSA and EWS and create/revise action plans for individual students.
Utilize VCS Data Chat Protocol and Decision Trees to determine appropriate resources.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

Utilize VCS Curriculum maps and Decision Trees to determine appropriate resources.
Resource- K-2- Implement Being a Reader
Data-BAR Placement Assessment
Timeline- Implement in August and adjust groups monthly

Resource- K-2- SIPPS
Data-SIPPs Placement Assessment
Timeline- Implement in August and adjust groups monthly

Resource- K-2- Ufli
Data-QPA
Timeline- Implement in September and adjust groups monthly

Resource- 3-5- Magnetic Reading
Data-Use FAST PM and VBAs to identify individual benchmarks
Timeline- Implement in September and adjust groups monthly

Resource- 3-5- iReady (ELA & Math)
Data-Pre-requisite reports & Quickstart Activity
Timeline- Implement in August and adjust daily

Resource- 2-5- Magma Math

Data- Use FAST PM and VBAs to identify individual benchmarks
Timeline- Implement in September and adjust groups monthly

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.	**No**

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