Pinellas County Schools

HIGHLAND LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHL

2026-27 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

At Highland Lakes Elementary, we lead together—teachers, parents, and community—empowering every student to grow, achieve, and thrive as they prepare for college, careers, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement

To create a vibrant school community where every student is inspired to become a leader and lifelong learner to achieve 100% student success.

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

Julie Brewster

brewsterju@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee all operational and instructional practices within the school. Lead school improvement initiatives. Use data to drive decision-making. Support teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Foster collaboration among staff, families, and the community. Monitor and evaluate progress toward SIP goals.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Daniel Lennox

lennoxd@pcsb.org

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist with all operational and instructional practices within the school. Support school improvement efforts. Use data to guide decision-making. Promote student achievement and school success. Foster collaboration among staff and families. Monitor progress toward SIP goals.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Mary Wightman

wightmanm@pcsb.org

Position Title
Intermediate Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Collaborate with administrators, teachers, and stakeholders to analyze student achievement, attendance, behavior, and other school performance data to identify areas for improvement. Assist in establishing school-wide goals, action steps, and progress-monitoring measures aligned with district and state expectations.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Taylor Martins

martinstay@pcsb.org

Position Title
Art Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Collaborate with administrators, teachers, and stakeholders to analyze student achievement, attendance, behavior, and other school performance data to identify areas for improvement. Assist in establishing school-wide goals, action steps, and progress-monitoring measures aligned with district and state expectations.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name
Vickey Sboukis

sboukisv@pcsb.org

Position Title
School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Collaborate with administrators, teachers, families, and community stakeholders to support school improvement goals and student success.
Analyze academic, attendance, behavior, and social-emotional data to identify trends, gaps, and areas of need. Assist in developing and implementing data-driven interventions and support systems aligned with SIP objectives.

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.

Stakeholder involvement and input was provided in April/May/June, 2026 in the following ways:

- Faculty and staff through Staff Meeting & SIP Committee Planning meeting
- Parents, Community members through School Advisory Committee (SAC) and PTA meetings
- Students through surveying during Lunch periods (students in grades 3 and 5)

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)).

- Weekly: PLC expectations
- Monthly: ILT data review

- Quarterly: Data implementation checks
- Ongoing: Equity walkthroughs

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 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**
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**60.5%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**NO**
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	**ATSI**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 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 **2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.*	**2025-26: B** **2024-25: B** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: B** **2021-22: B**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2026-27

Using 2025-26 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	21	43	52	64	51	67				298
Absent 10% or more school days	0	6	9	6	5	9				35
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	1				6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	0				1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	0				4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	10	10	2	4				26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	8	11	6	3				32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	0	2	3	1	0				6
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 2026-27

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	0	1	7	10	8	2				28

Current Year 2026-27

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		1		2						3
Students retained two or more times										0

Prior Year (2025-26) 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	
School Enrollment	31	54	68	57	67	71				348
Absent 10% or more school days		9	7	6	6	14				42
One or more suspensions		6	1	6	4	3				20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)					3	2				5
Course failure in Math						7				7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				8	16					24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		6	7	13	4	9				39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (2025-26) 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		5	2	8	5	13				33

Prior Year (2025-26) 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		2						4
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 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	67	68	62	59	64	59	62	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	70	70	61	75	67	59	72	63	58
ELA Learning Gains	60	65	63	53	62	60	58	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53	63	58	61	59	56	59	62	57
Math Achievement*	68	72	66	69	69	64	70	66	62
Math Learning Gains	56	69	64	56	67	63	74	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38	56	50	49	56	51	69	58	52
Science Achievement	60	72	62	57	70	58	70	69	57
Social Studies Achievement*			95			92			
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					67	63		65	61

*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)

2025-26 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	59%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	472
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
59%	62%	67%	58%	61%	62%	

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 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	39%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	63%	No		
Hispanic Students	65%	No		
Multiracial Students	92%	No		
White Students	59%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	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.

2025-26 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 2024-25	C&C ACCEL 2024-25	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	67%	70%	60%	53%	68%	56%	38%	60%					
Students With Disabilities	35%		46%	40%	40%	52%	43%	17%					
English Language Learners	60%		70%		60%	60%							
Hispanic Students	60%	64%	60%		75%	64%		64%					
Multiracial Students	100%				83%								
White Students	66%	67%	57%	52%	68%	57%	46%	61%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	39%	64%	53%	60%	48%	27%	58%					

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	59%	75%	53%	61%	69%	56%	49%	57%					82%
Students With Disabilities	33%	50%	48%	57%	43%	48%	35%	14%					
English Language Learners	40%				50%								82%
Black/African American Students	8%		40%		18%								
Hispanic Students	63%		63%		70%	53%		75%					
Multiracial Students	73%				91%								
White Students	60%	75%	53%	65%	70%	57%	50%	57%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	46%	55%	58%	58%	54%	47%	42%	46%					

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	62%	72%	58%	59%	70%	74%	69%	70%					
Students With Disabilities	30%	36%	67%	80%	25%	62%	68%	46%					
Hispanic Students	60%		50%		77%	59%							
Multiracial Students	67%				75%								
White Students	63%	73%	59%	61%	71%	77%	70%	64%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49%	63%	54%	57%	55%	67%	70%	58%					

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.

2025-26 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	66%	68%	-2%	60%	6%
ELA	4	75%	66%	9%	60%	15%
ELA	5	56%	66%	-10%	61%	-5%
Math	3	70%	71%	-1%	66%	4%
Math	4	76%	72%	4%	65%	11%
Math	5	56%	69%	-13%	62%	-6%
Science	5	59%	70%	-11%	60%	-1%

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?

The accountability data indicates that ELA Learning Gains demonstrated the most significant improvement from the prior year. The school's performance increased from 53 in 2025 to 60 in 2026, reflecting a +7 point gain, which represents the largest positive change across all measured components.

This improvement highlights the effectiveness of targeted instructional strategies implemented during the school year. The school placed a strong emphasis on data-driven instruction, including regular progress monitoring cycles and the use of formative assessment data to guide small-group instruction. Teachers increased the use of differentiated literacy instruction, particularly for students performing just below proficiency, ensuring that instruction was responsive to individual student needs. Additionally, structured intervention blocks and focused professional development in literacy contributed to improved student outcomes.

The upward trend in ELA Learning Gains suggests that the school's systems for monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction are yielding positive results and should be sustained and expanded.

Lowest Performance

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

The lowest-performing data component for the current year is Math Lowest 25th Percentile, with a score of 38. This indicates that the school's most academically vulnerable students in mathematics are significantly underperforming compared to other subgroups.

Several contributing factors have impacted this outcome. First, there appears to be a lack of consistent foundational math skills, particularly among students who have experienced cumulative learning gaps over multiple years. Second, intervention strategies may not have been implemented with sufficient intensity or fidelity to accelerate learning for the lowest-performing students. Additionally, gaps in Tier 1 core instruction may have contributed to uneven student readiness for

grade-level standards.

Trend data further underscores this concern. The Math Lowest 25th Percentile has declined steadily over time, from 69 in 2024 to 49 in 2025 and 38 in 2026, representing a three-year downward trend. This pattern indicates a systemic issue requiring immediate and sustained attention, particularly in how the school supports and monitors its most struggling learners in mathematics.

Greatest Decline

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year is also Math Lowest 25th Percentile, which decreased by 11 points from 49 in 2025 to 38 in 2026.

This decline suggests that existing intervention efforts were insufficient to meet the needs of the lowest-performing students. Contributing factors likely include inconsistent delivery of targeted interventions, insufficient progress monitoring practices, and a potential misalignment between instructional strategies and student learning needs. Furthermore, attendance challenges, as reflected in Early Warning System (EWS) data showing 35 students absent 10% or more of instructional days, likely reduced students' access to consistent intervention and core instruction.

The continued decline highlights an urgent need to strengthen the school's multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) in mathematics, ensuring that interventions are both timely and effective, and that student progress is closely monitored.

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.

The largest gap between school performance and the state average is observed in Science Achievement. The school's performance in 2026 is 60, compared to a recent state benchmark of approximately 70, indicating a gap of about 10 points.

This gap may be attributed to several factors. Historically, instructional priority has been placed on ELA and mathematics due to accountability pressures, potentially resulting in reduced instructional time and focus for science. Additionally, there may be inconsistencies in the implementation of rigorous, standards-aligned science instruction, including limited opportunities for hands-on, inquiry-based learning experiences that promote deeper understanding.

Trend patterns suggest that this is not a one-year issue but rather a persistent area of need, as science performance has remained below state levels across multiple years. Addressing this gap will

require intentional planning, including strengthening curriculum alignment, increasing instructional time, and providing professional development to enhance science instruction.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Analysis of the Early Warning System (EWS) data reveals two primary areas of concern that may be contributing to overall student performance challenges.

The first area of concern is chronic absenteeism, with 35 students (approximately 12% of enrollment) missing 10% or more of school days. This issue is particularly concerning because consistent attendance is critical for academic success. Students with high absenteeism are less likely to benefit from core instruction and intervention supports, which may directly impact achievement outcomes, especially in mathematics.

The second area of concern is early academic risk, particularly in foundational skill areas. The data shows 32 students scoring at Level 1 in Math and 26 students scoring at Level 1 in ELA, along with 6 students identified with substantial reading deficiencies in grades K–3. These indicators suggest that a significant number of students are not meeting grade-level expectations and require targeted, intensive support.

Together, these concerns highlight the need for early identification, consistent monitoring, and targeted interventions to prevent long-term academic difficulties.

Highest Priorities

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

Based on the analysis of accountability and EWS data, the following priorities have been identified for the upcoming school year:

Priority 1: Strengthen Mathematics Intervention Systems

The school will prioritize improving outcomes for the lowest-performing students in mathematics by implementing structured, high-impact intervention strategies. This includes increasing intervention time, enhancing progress monitoring practices, and ensuring fidelity of implementation across all grade levels.

Priority 2: Strengthen Achievement and Learning Gains for ESSA Subgroups (ESE and Black Students)

The school will prioritize improving outcomes for ESSA subgroups, specifically Students with Disabilities (ESE) and Black students. While both groups demonstrated growth in ELA Achievement (ESE: 33% to 38%; Black students: 8% to 25%) and solid Learning Gains (ESE: 52%; Black students:

50%), overall proficiency levels remain below schoolwide expectations. The school will focus on strengthening Tier 1 differentiated instruction, increasing targeted small-group interventions, and utilizing ongoing data monitoring to ensure sustained growth and accelerated progress toward proficiency for these subgroups.

Priority 3: Improve Tier 1 Mathematics Instruction
A focus will be placed on strengthening core instruction in mathematics to ensure alignment with standards and consistency across classrooms. Professional development will support teachers in delivering rigorous, conceptually focused instruction.

Priority 4: Sustain and Expand ELA Instructional Gains
Building on the success in ELA Learning Gains, the school will continue to refine small-group instruction, utilize data-driven decision-making, and provide targeted support to students approaching proficiency.

Priority 5: Increase Focus on Science Instruction
To address the identified performance gap, the school will enhance science instruction through improved curriculum alignment, increased instructional time, and the integration of engaging, inquiry-based learning experiences.

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 Collaborative Planning, Professional Learning Communities

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.

Highland Lakes Elementary will use weekly PLCs to align planning, instruction, and assessment, ensuring all K–5 students engage in rigorous, grade-level learning with strong thinking, reading, writing, and problem-solving.

This approach ensures that planning, instruction, and intervention are aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. Standards and responsive to real-time student data.

Analysis of prior year FAST PM data, common assessment results, and walkthrough evidence identified the following needs:

- Inconsistent alignment between instructional planning and classroom implementation, resulting in variability in access to grade-level standards aligned tasks
- Lack of a predictable PLC structure to ensure that data analysis consistently leads to instructional adjustments
- Limited alignment of differentiation and intervention to real-time student performance data
- Missed opportunities to use PM data (PM1, PM2) to adjust instruction and regroup students

These findings indicate a need for a coherent system that connects planning, data analysis, and instructional response, ensuring that all students receive timely and targeted support.

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.

ELA Grade 3 proficiency will increase from 70% to 75% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
ELA Grade 3 - 5 proficiency will increase from 67% to 72% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
ELA learning gains will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.

ELA L25 learning gains will increase from 53% to 60% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.

Math Grade 3 - 5 proficiency will increase from 69% to 75% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
Math learning gains will increase from 56% to 65% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
Math L25 learning gains will increase from 38% to 55% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.

Science proficiency will increase from 60% to 70% as measured by PM 3 SSA.

Monitoring

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

Implementation will be monitored through:

- Weekly PLC documentation and agenda review to ensure planning and data analysis protocols are followed
- Instructional walkthroughs to verify alignment between planning and classroom implementation
- Monthly Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) data reviews to evaluate effectiveness of planning and instructional adjustments
- Quarterly Data Implementation Checks to ensure that identified strategies and reteach plans are implemented with fidelity

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Julie Brewster & Daniel Lennox

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:

The school will implement a structured, evidence-based collaborative planning model through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) across all grade levels (K–5) to ensure coherent, standards-aligned instruction and responsive teaching practices. The intervention includes: Bi-weekly PLC cycles aligned to content: - Week A (ELA PLC): Standards alignment, task design, anticipation of misconceptions, and planning of scaffolds and enrichment - Week B (Math PLC): Student work analysis, error identification, and targeted reteach planning Implementation of data-driven instruction practices using FAST progress monitoring (PM1, PM2, PM3) and ongoing formative assessments to guide instructional decision-making Use of explicit instructional planning practices, including: - Clearly defined learning targets and success criteria and anticipated student responses - Integration of the instructional framework Think It, Read It, Solve It, Lead It to ensure that planning translates into meaningful student engagement and higher-order thinking

Rationale:
This intervention was selected based on analysis of prior year FAST PM data, common assessment data, and instructional walkthrough trends, which revealed: - Inconsistent alignment between lesson planning and instructional delivery, resulting in variability in access to grade-level standards - Lack of a consistent PLC structure, limiting the effectiveness of collaborative planning and instructional decision-making - Limited use of student data to inform immediate instructional adjustments - Variability in task design and instructional rigor across classrooms Research supports that structured PLCs and collaborative planning models improve instructional quality and student outcomes when they include data analysis, shared accountability, and clear instructional expectations. This intervention addresses the need for a coherent, consistent planning system that ensures all students receive high-quality, standards-aligned instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong 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
Strengthen Coherent, Standards-Aligned Planning

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster

By When/Frequency:
Continuous / Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Implement a consistent PLC planning structure that ensures all lessons include clear, grade-level tasks aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. Standards, with identified success criteria, anticipated misconceptions, and planned scaffolds to support student access.
Key Actions:
- Establish a schoolwide ELA and Math PLC planning protocol
- Require teachers to plan explicit tasks and anticipated responses
- Monitor alignment between lesson plans and classroom implementation of instruction through walkthroughs

Action Step #2
Implement Data-Driven Instructional Cycles

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster & Daniel Lennox

By When/Frequency:
Continuous / Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Establish a predictable process for analyzing FAST (PM1, PM2, PM3) and classroom assessment data to identify student misconceptions and adjust instruction within a 48-hour timeframe.
Key Actions:
- Use structured PLC protocols for student work analysis
- Require documented instructional adjustments based on data
- Conduct regular data reviews and implementation checks to ensure fidelity

Action Step #3
Align Differentiation and Intervention to Student Needs

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster/ Daniel Lennox

By When/Frequency:
Continuously

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Develop and implement a schoolwide system for flexible grouping, differentiation, and intervention to ensure that all students receive targeted support based on real-time data.
Key Actions:
- Regroup students bi-weekly based on progress monitoring data
- Implement tiered instruction (Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3) with aligned supports
- Use intervention blocks with clear structures, roles, and progress tracking tools

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

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.

The school will strengthen benchmark-aligned instruction by ensuring that teaching and learning consistently reflect the depth and complexity required for student mastery through the **Think, Read, Solve, Lead instructional framework**.
This focus will directly impact student learning by increasing the consistency, clarity, and quality of Tier 1 instruction in every classroom. Through structured lesson routines embedded in each phase of **Think, Read, Solve, Lead**, instruction will remain tightly aligned to benchmarks, ensuring students engage daily in rigorous, grade-level content.

- **THINK (Set Purpose & Align to Standards):**
  Teachers establish clear learning targets and success criteria aligned to benchmarks, activating prior knowledge and preparing students for rigorous learning.
- **READ (Engage with Grade-Level Content):**
  Students interact with complex texts and tasks that reflect the full depth and complexity of the benchmarks, supported through explicit instruction and modeling.
- **SOLVE (Apply & Demonstrate Understanding):**
  Students process and apply learning through writing, discourse, and problem-solving tasks aligned to benchmark expectations, allowing teachers to monitor understanding and adjust instruction.
- **LEAD (Synthesize & Reflect):**
  Students demonstrate mastery through structured closing routines, providing evidence of

learning aligned to benchmarks and informing next instructional steps.

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.

ELA Grade 3 proficiency will increase from 70% to 75% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
ELA Grade 3 - 5 proficiency will increase from 67% to 72% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
ELA learning gains will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
ELA L25 learning gains will increase from 53% to 60% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.

Math Grade 3 - 5 proficiency will increase from 69% to 75% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
Math learning gains will increase from 56% to 65% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
Math L25 learning gains will increase from 38% to 55% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.

Science proficiency will increase from 60% to 70% as measured by PM 3 SSA.

Monitoring

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

Implementation and impact of this area of focus will be monitored through a systematic cycle of observation, data analysis, and continuous feedback aligned to the **Think, Read, Solve, Lead framework**.

School leaders will monitor the consistent use of benchmark-aligned instructional practices through:

- **Walkthroughs and Observations:** Regular classroom walkthroughs using a common look-for tool aligned to Think–Read–Solve–Lead will capture evidence of:
- Clear learning targets and success criteria (Think)
- Engagement with grade-level texts/tasks (Read)
- Use of write-to-learn, student discourse, and checks for understanding (Solve)
- Effective lesson closure aligned to the standard (Lead)
- **Coaching Cycles:** Instructional leaders will provide job-embedded coaching, including modeling, co-planning, and feedback focused on strengthening alignment, rigor, and consistency of instructional routines.
- **Professional Learning Communities (PLCs):** PLCs will monitor implementation by collaboratively planning aligned lessons and reflecting on instructional practices using shared expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Julie Brewster / Daniel Lennox

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:
Strengthen responsive, benchmark-aligned instruction across grades K–5 by implementing the Think–Read–Solve–Lead instructional framework, supported by consistent lesson opening and closing routines and the intentional integration of write-to-learn strategies, student discourse, and frequent checks for understanding. This approach is designed to improve Tier 1 instruction, ensure tight alignment between standards, instruction, and assessment, and foster language-rich learning environments that promote academic vocabulary development, student thinking, and meaningful engagement with grade-level content.

Rationale:
This approach is designed to improve Tier 1 instruction, ensure tight alignment between standards, instruction, and assessment, and foster language-rich learning environments that promote academic vocabulary development, student thinking, and meaningful engagement with grade-level content. Research supports that high-quality Tier 1 instruction aligned to grade-level standards has the greatest impact on student achievement and reduces the need for intervention. Practices such as explicit instruction, formative assessment, and structured instructional frameworks are widely recognized as effective in improving student outcomes, particularly for diverse learners and struggling students. By implementing these evidence-based strategies, the school is addressing the root cause identified in the data: inconsistent instructional alignment and rigor across classrooms. Strengthening benchmark-aligned instruction ensures that all students, including ESE and Black students, have equitable access to grade-level expectations, which is essential for increasing proficiency, sustaining learning gains, and closing achievement gaps. This will result in: Increased student performance on FAST ELA and Mathematics assessments (PM1, PM2, PM3) Improved proficiency and learning gains, particularly among RAISE and ESSA subgroups Enhanced ability to transfer knowledge across content areas

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong 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
Implement Consistent Instructional Routines (Think–Read–Solve–Lead)

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster

By When/Frequency:
Ongoing / Weekly

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

step:
Teachers will implement a consistent instructional framework across all classrooms that includes clear opening (Think) and closing (Lead) routines, along with structured opportunities for reading, application, and reflection. Lesson openings will establish learning targets, activate prior knowledge, and introduce academic vocabulary, while closings will require students to synthesize and demonstrate their understanding. This consistency will strengthen alignment to benchmarks and ensure all students engage in grade-level content daily.

Action Step #2
Integrate Write-to-Learn, Student Discourse, and Checks for Understanding

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster / Daniel Lennox

By When/Frequency:
Continuously

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teachers will intentionally embed write-to-learn strategies, structured student discourse, and frequent checks for understanding throughout the Read and Solve phases of instruction. Students will regularly write, speak, and collaborate to process learning, explain thinking, and justify responses. Teachers will use these strategies as real-time formative assessment tools to monitor understanding and adjust instruction to meet student needs.

Action Step #3
Monitor Implementation and Use Data to Drive Instructional Decisions

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster / Daniel Lennox

By When/Frequency:
Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
School leaders and teachers will monitor the implementation of instructional routines and practices through walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and coaching cycles aligned to Think–Read–Solve–Lead. Student work, formative data, and progress monitoring results will be analyzed during PLCs to assess impact on learning. Data will be used to refine Tier 1 instruction, provide targeted small-group support, and ensure continuous progress toward improved student outcomes.

Action Step #4
Provide Ongoing Instructional Coaching and Feedback

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster/ Daniel Lennox

By When/Frequency:
Continuously

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
School leaders will implement a systematic coaching and feedback cycle to support high-quality instruction. This will include frequent classroom walkthroughs, targeted observations, and job-embedded coaching aligned to Think–Read–Solve–Lead routines. Leaders will provide timely, actionable feedback focused on strengthening lesson openings and closings, increasing the use of writing and discourse, and ensuring alignment to benchmarks. Coaching will include modeling, co-planning, and follow-up support to build teacher capacity and ensure consistent implementation across classrooms.

Area of Focus #3

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD), Black/ African American Students (BLK)

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.

A critical area of focus for the upcoming school year is improving ELA achievement and learning gains for Students with Disabilities (ESE) and Black students across all tested grade levels (grades 3–5).

While both subgroups demonstrated measurable growth from the prior year, overall achievement levels remain below schoolwide expectations, indicating a continued need for targeted support.

ESE student ELA achievement increased from 33% to 38%, with learning gains at 52%, reflecting progress but insufficient movement toward proficiency. Similarly, Black students showed a significant increase in ELA achievement from 8% to 25%, with learning gains at 50%, demonstrating improvement but still performing below desired benchmarks.

This area of focus was identified through analysis of prior-year accountability and subgroup data, which revealed persistent achievement gaps despite gains in student progress. These trends suggest that while intervention and instructional strategies are supporting growth, additional emphasis is needed on strengthening Tier 1 differentiated instruction, ensuring consistent access to grade-level content, and expanding targeted small-group supports aligned to subgroup needs.

Addressing this area is essential to improving overall student outcomes, closing achievement gaps, and ensuring equitable learning opportunities for all students.

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.

ELA proficiency for the Black subgroup will increase from 25% to 60% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.
ELA proficiency for the ESE subgroup will increase from 38% to 50% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.

ELA learning gains for the Black subgroup will increase from 50% to 65% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.

ELA learning gains for the ESE subgroup will increase from 52% to 65% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment.

Monitoring

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

Progress in this area of focus will be monitored through a structured system that emphasizes both implementation fidelity and student outcome data. Teachers and school leaders will engage in regular data cycles (every 3–6 weeks) to review formative assessments, subgroup performance, and progress toward ELA proficiency and learning gains for ESE and Black students.
Implementation will be monitored through:

- Classroom walkthroughs and observations to ensure effective Tier 1 differentiated instruction and alignment to grade-level standards
- Review of small-group intervention plans and schedules to verify that targeted supports are being delivered consistently
- Ongoing use of progress monitoring tools to track individual student growth and adjust instruction in real time Impact will be measured by:
- Increases in subgroup performance on interim and benchmark assessments
- Growth in ELA learning gains data and movement of students toward proficiency levels
- Reduction in the number of students performing below grade level within each subgroup

School leadership teams will meet regularly to analyze trends, identify students needing additional support, and make timely instructional adjustments. This continuous monitoring process ensures that strategies are effectively implemented and that progress toward closing achievement gaps remains on track.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Julie Brewster, Principal

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:

Implement a targeted, scaffolded instructional approach for ESE and Black students aligned to the Think–Read–Solve–Lead framework. Instruction will emphasize consistent lesson routines, including structured openings and closings, while embedding enhanced supports such as explicit modeling, guided practice, and strategic scaffolds (e.g., visuals, sentence frames, chunking of text). Students will engage in grade-level content with increased opportunities for write-to-learn, structured discourse,

and frequent checks for understanding to strengthen comprehension, language development, and academic confidence across Tier 1 and Tier 2/3 settings.

Rationale:
ESE and Black students require increased access to rigorous, grade-level instruction that is both intentionally scaffolded and consistently delivered. By strengthening Tier 1 instruction through predictable routines and integrated language-rich practices, students will have more opportunities to process, express, and apply their learning. Aligning Tier 1 and intervention supports ensures coherence, reduces instructional gaps, and promotes equitable outcomes. This focused approach will accelerate learning gains, improve engagement, and increase student proficiency by addressing both skill development and access to complex content.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong 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
Implement Scaffolded Think–Read–Solve–Lead Routines

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster

By When/Frequency:
Continuously

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
The school will ensure all teachers are trained and equipped to: Ensure all lessons include structured openings (Think) and closings (Lead), Provide scaffolds (visuals, sentence stems, modeling) to support access and maintain consistent routines across Tier 1 and intervention settings.
The school will monitor the impact of this action step by using a combination of student performance data, instructional evidence, and ongoing data analysis cycles to determine effectiveness and make timely adjustments.
Analysis of Student Work and Formative Data: Teachers will regularly review student writing samples, exit tickets, and responses from discourse activities to assess how well students are processing and demonstrating understanding of grade-level content. Increased quality and depth of student responses will indicate improved impact.
Progress Monitoring and Assessment Data:
Student performance will be tracked using progress monitoring tools, common unit assessments, and benchmark assessments. Data will be disaggregated to specifically monitor growth and proficiency of ESE and Black students over time.
Correlation to Instructional Practices:
Leaders will compare student outcome data with implementation data (walkthrough trends, lesson artifacts) to determine which practices are having the greatest impact and where additional support is needed.
Continuous Improvement Cycle:
Findings from data reviews will inform instructional adjustments, targeted interventions, and professional development to ensure sustained improvement and progress toward desired outcomes.

Action Step #2

Intensify Writing, Discourse, and Formative Assessment

Person Monitoring:
Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:
Continuously

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teachers will embed daily write-to-learn strategies (guided responses, quick writes), Use structured discourse protocols (partner talk, accountable talk), Increase frequency of checks for understanding to monitor progress.
The school will monitor the impact of this action step by using a combination of student performance data, instructional evidence, and ongoing data analysis cycles to determine effectiveness and make timely adjustments.
Analysis of Student Work and Formative Data: Teachers will regularly review student writing samples, exit tickets, and responses from discourse activities to assess how well students are processing and demonstrating understanding of grade-level content. Increased quality and depth of student responses will indicate improved impact.
Progress Monitoring and Assessment Data:
Student performance will be tracked using progress monitoring tools, common unit assessments, and benchmark assessments. Data will be disaggregated to specifically monitor growth and proficiency of ESE and Black students over time.

Action Step #3
Align Tier 2/3 Supports to Core Instruction

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster

By When/Frequency:
Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Use the same instructional routines across tiers by providing additional time, smaller groups, and explicit instruction that
targets skill gaps based on data while maintaining grade-level alignment.
The school will monitor the impact of this action step by using a combination of student performance data, instructional evidence, and ongoing data analysis cycles to determine effectiveness and make timely adjustments.
Subgroup Tracking: School leadership will closely monitor achievement and learning gains for ESE and Black students to ensure the action step is closing gaps. Data dashboards and reports will be used to track progress toward SIP goals.
Correlation to Instructional Practices: Leaders will compare student outcome data with implementation data (walkthrough trends, lesson artifacts) to determine which practices are having the greatest impact and where additional support is needed.
Continuous Improvement Cycle: Findings from data reviews will inform instructional adjustments, targeted interventions, and professional development to ensure sustained improvement and progress toward desired outcomes.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

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.

The school will implement a cohesive, schoolwide culture that integrates PBIS practices, the house system, and LEAD expectations to foster belonging, engagement, and collaboration for both students and staff, aligned to the Think, Read, Solve, Lead (TRSL) framework..

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.

Increase student engagement and teacher retention by increasing student engagement indicators (e.g., on-task behavior, active academic participation) by 15% as measured through walkthrough data and PBIS metrics.

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.

School leadership will monitor implementation through PLC artifacts, walkthrough data (TRSL, LEAD, engagement), PBIS data, staff participation, and climate surveys. Teacher retention and feedback will be reviewed quarterly to identify trends and adjust supports. PLC discussions and leadership team meetings will ensure alignment between planning, culture, and outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Julie Brewster

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:

The school will develop a unified culture where both students and teachers experience consistent expectations, strong relationships, and opportunities for leadership. Through the house system and LEAD expectations, staff and students will engage in a shared framework that promotes positive interactions, collaboration, and ownership of learning. Teachers will use collaborative planning and PLCs to embed Think, Read, Solve, Lead into instruction while also strengthening professional collaboration, collective efficacy, and support. PLCs will serve as a structure for analyzing academic, behavioral, and engagement data to plan instruction and supports that improve both student outcomes and teacher experience. Intentional efforts will be made to build staff belonging and leadership through recognition, mentorship, and opportunities to lead within PLCs and the house system. This aligned structure ensures that a positive student culture and a supportive adult culture

are developed simultaneously.

Rationale:
A strong, consistent school culture directly impacts both student achievement and teacher retention. When PBIS systems, leadership opportunities, and collaborative structures are aligned, they create an environment where students are engaged and teachers feel supported and valued. Embedding TRSL into both instructional practice and professional collaboration ensures clarity, purpose, and shared expectations across the school. By integrating student behavior systems (PBIS) with adult culture (teacher support and leadership), the school creates a sustainable model that improves engagement, reduces burnout, and increases retention while ensuring all students access rigorous learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong 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
Collaborative PLC Culture

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster

By When/Frequency:
Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Use weekly PLCs to analyze academic, behavioral, and staff engagement data; plan TRSL-aligned instruction; and strengthen collaboration, problem-solving, and teacher voice.

Action Step #2
Unified PBIS & House System

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster

By When/Frequency:
Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Maintain a consistent PBIS framework through the house system and LEAD expectations to promote belonging, positive relationships, recognition, and leadership for both students and staff.

Action Step #3
Data-Driven Support & Retention

Person Monitoring:
Julie Brewster

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Collect and use student, staff, and retention data (e.g., surveys, walkthroughs, participation) to adjust supports, improve working conditions, and strengthen both student engagement and teacher satisfaction.

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.

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 Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(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 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)).

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

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

We work with the district through regular data reviews and planning meetings to ensure resources align with student needs. Academic and behavioral data guide decisions about funding, staffing, and instructional supports. We participate in Title I and schoolwide planning to align resources with improvement goals. Budget plans are submitted with justifications, and district feedback ensures resources are used effectively and equitably to support student success.

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).

We will continue to use district instructional coaches, intervention materials, and targeted professional development as key resources to address identified student needs. Data from FAST assessments, classroom performance, and progress monitoring show a need for support in foundational reading and math skills, particularly among our BLK and ESE student populations. key staff will provide job-embedded support beginning in August, focusing on high-impact strategies and small group instruction. Intervention materials will be used during Tier 2 and Tier 3 time blocks, starting in September, based on diagnostic data. Professional development in culturally responsive teaching and effective interventions will be ongoing throughout the year to build teacher capacity and close achievement gaps.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. **No**

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