

Pinellas County Schools

MIDTOWN ACADEMY



2026-27 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..... 4

 D. Early Warning Systems 5

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 8

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 9

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 10

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 11

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 12

 E. Grade Level Data Review 15

III. Planning for Improvement..... 16

IV. Positive Learning Environment 29

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 33

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 36

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 38

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

The Mission of Midtown Academy is to develop the academic and social emotional skills of every scholar, every day, at every opportunity by committing to academic excellence through a rigorous instructional program and developing the leadership qualities needed for college, career, and life

Provide the school's vision statement

Midtown Academy will provide each and every scholar with the necessary knowledge, skills, and opportunities for 100% scholar 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

Keila Victor

victork@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provides strategic leadership to ensure a safe, student-centered learning environment by overseeing school operations, supporting high-quality instruction, using data to drive decision-making, developing staff capacity, fostering family and community partnerships, and ensuring compliance with district, state, and federal guidelines to improve student achievement and overall school effectiveness.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Calysta Davis

daviscal@pcsb.org

Position Title

Curriculum Specialist/Gifted Magnet Coordinator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Gifted Magnet Coordinator and Curriculum Specialist leads and refines a rigorous, standards-aligned gifted program, supports teachers through coaching and professional learning on differentiated and advanced instructional practices, uses student data to drive decisions that improve achievement, coordinates gifted identification and progress monitoring to ensure equitable access, and ensures high-quality curriculum implementation while maintaining compliance with district and state guidelines.

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.

All stakeholders were invited to a SAC meeting to give input for the School Improvement Plan for the 25-26 school year. The input is used to help drive the plan.

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 school improvement plan is a live document. We will continuously monitor the progress of scholars through data chats using progress monitoring data. We will make necessary adjustments to improve the academic progress of scholars.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY KG-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	57.4%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	N/A
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) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2025-26: A 2024-25: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: A

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	30	41	52	57	58	71				309
Absent 10% or more school days	0	5	3	8	7	7				30
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	4	1	1				8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	1	8	2	7				18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	1	6	0	9				16
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	0	1	0	0				1
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	1	0	0				1

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	0	1	6	1	10				18

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	0	0	0	1	0	1				2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0				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										0
Absent 10% or more school days										0
One or more suspensions										0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)										0
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment										0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment										0
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										0

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										0
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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 CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]
ELA Achievement*	78	68	62	68	64	59	69	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	84	70	61	70	67	59	68	63	58
ELA Learning Gains	78	65	63	71	62	60	68	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64	63	58	63	59	56	50	62	57
Math Achievement*	80	72	66	66	69	64	68	66	62
Math Learning Gains	73	69	64	58	67	63	60	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53	56	50	27	56	51	56	58	52
Science Achievement	76	72	62	80	70	58	72	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)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	73%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	586
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
73%	63%	64%	66%	63%	42%	

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	54%	No		
Black/African American Students	58%	No		
Hispanic Students	88%	No		
Multiracial Students	79%	No		
White Students	89%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	64%	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	78%	84%	78%	64%	80%	73%	53%	76%					
Students With Disabilities	42%		59%	56%	55%	70%	67%	31%					
Black/African American Students	52%	44%	74%	68%	56%	63%	57%	46%					
Hispanic Students	100%		76%		92%	82%							
Multiracial Students	73%		70%		93%	80%							
White Students	91%	100%	83%		90%	76%		92%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	65%	67%	77%	70%	66%	61%	57%	50%					

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	68%	70%	71%	63%	66%	58%	27%	80%					
Students With Disabilities	24%	23%	58%	63%	31%	39%	28%	31%					
Black/African American Students	34%	52%	50%	54%	34%	30%	30%	46%					
Hispanic Students	100%		86%		76%	50%							
Multiracial Students	63%		100%		56%	64%							
White Students	85%	83%	76%		86%	76%		95%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	47%	56%	63%	55%	45%	40%	29%	68%					

Page 13 of 39

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	69%	68%	68%	50%	68%	60%	56%	72%					
Students With Disabilities	24%		42%	37%	27%	50%	50%						
Black/African American Students	31%	30%	43%	44%	33%	53%	52%	47%					
Hispanic Students	79%		92%		79%	67%							
Multiracial Students	82%		75%		82%	58%							
White Students	90%	83%	79%		85%	64%		85%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	45%	35%	51%	50%	49%	64%	60%	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	84%	68%	16%	60%	24%
ELA	4	72%	66%	6%	60%	12%
ELA	5	77%	66%	11%	61%	16%
Math	3	88%	71%	17%	66%	22%
Math	4	78%	72%	6%	65%	13%
Math	5	73%	69%	4%	62%	11%
Science	5	76%	70%	6%	60%	16%

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 data component demonstrating the greatest improvement was fourth grade mathematics. Proficiency increased significantly from 57% in the 2024–2025 school year to 80% in the 2025–2026 school year.

This growth can be attributed to a strategic, schoolwide focus on strengthening mathematics instruction. Key actions included the implementation of a math coach who provided ongoing support through coaching cycles, modeling of effective instructional practices, and collaborative planning with teachers. Additionally, staff participated in targeted professional development days, allowing for intentional and standards-aligned lesson planning.

Instructional practices also shifted to include the consistent use of manipulatives, promoting hands-on, experiential learning opportunities that deepened conceptual understanding. These combined efforts resulted in increased student engagement and improved mathematical outcomes.

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 Science data component reflected the lowest performance, with 76% of students demonstrating proficiency. Although this remains a relatively strong outcome, it represents a decline from the previous year's 80%, indicating a downward trend in student achievement within this content area. A review of contributing factors suggests that inconsistent implementation of standards-aligned, hands-on, and inquiry-based instructional practices limited opportunities for deep conceptual understanding and student engagement. Additionally, student performance may have been impacted by test fatigue during the assessment window, affecting stamina and focus. Trends in student work and assessment data also indicate that deficits in reading stamina and comprehension hindered students' ability to effectively access and analyze complex Science texts and questions. This intersection between literacy skills and content understanding continues to be a critical area for targeted support and instructional refinement.

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 that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Science. We went from 80% proficiency to 76% proficiency. Several factors contributed to this decrease in performance. Instructional delivery in Science lacked consistent implementation of interactive, hands-on learning experiences, which impacted student engagement and depth of understanding of key concepts. Additionally, students demonstrated signs of test fatigue during the assessment window, which may have affected their ability to sustain focus and perform at their highest level. Finally, deficits in reading stamina and comprehension limited students' ability to effectively access and analyze complex Science texts and questions, further impacting overall achievement in this content area.

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 data component reflecting the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 3rd Grade Reading. Midtown Academy achieved 84% proficiency, significantly exceeding the state average of 60%, resulting in a positive gap of 24 percentage points. This outcome reflects a continued trend of strong literacy performance and sustained instructional focus.

This success can be attributed to the consistent implementation of differentiated, small-group instruction, allowing teachers to target specific student needs and accelerate learning. Additionally, staff engaged in high-impact professional development, including *The Writing Revolution*, Academic Discourse, and Micro Writing to Learn, which strengthened instructional practices and supported students' ability to effectively communicate and process complex texts.

Further contributing to this performance was the strategic use of a certified hourly reading teacher who provided targeted small-group intervention to address identified skill gaps. Classroom teachers also implemented research-based supports such as Seeing Stars and Accelerated Learning Plans to ensure instruction was responsive to individual student needs. Collectively, these aligned systems and practices resulted in increased student proficiency and a significant gap above the state average in 3rd Grade Reading.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Based on the Early Warning System (EWS) data from Part I, one primary area of concern is the 4th grade cohort. This group reflects the highest concentration of students performing at Level 1 in Reading, along with a notable number of in-school suspensions. In addition, the data indicates a significant number of students demonstrating overall academic and behavioral risk indicators within this grade level.

This pattern suggests a widening achievement and engagement gap for this cohort, with students increasingly falling below proficiency expectations in core academic areas. The combination of low reading performance and elevated behavioral incidents may be contributing to reduced instructional access and inconsistent academic progress.

Targeted academic interventions, along with intentional behavioral supports, will be essential to address these needs. A comprehensive, coordinated plan that integrates Tier 2/Tier 3 instruction, consistent progress monitoring, and behavior supports will be critical to closing gaps and accelerating student growth in this cohort.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Learning gains (Proficiency) specifically with ESSA subgroups.
2. Schoolwide ELA and Math Teaching and Learning
3. Schoolwide Science Teaching and Learning
4. Schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports 5. Attendance and Family Engagement

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.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to 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 key Area of Focus for the upcoming school year is the intentional acceleration of achievement for Black students in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics across all grade levels. This focus was identified based on prior year data reflecting a significant proficiency gap between overall schoolwide performance and the performance of Black students.

Specifically, schoolwide ELA proficiency was 78%, while Black students demonstrated 52% proficiency. In Mathematics, schoolwide proficiency was 80%, compared to 54% proficiency among Black students. These data points indicate a persistent and meaningful achievement gap that must be addressed to ensure equitable outcomes for all learners.

In response, targeted instructional practices, differentiated support, and intentional use of data-driven instruction will be prioritized to ensure that instruction meets the specific needs of Black students across all grade levels.

This Area of Focus was selected due to the clear disparity in performance trends and the need to accelerate growth through high-quality core instruction and systematic intervention supports.

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.

By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, the percentage of Black students in Grades 3–5 scoring at or above proficiency on the state assessment will increase reaching a minimum of 83% in ELA and 85% in Math. Progress will be monitored through quarterly district assessments and progress monitoring tools to ensure students are on track to meet the end-of-year targets.

Monitoring

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

Data Progress Monitoring:

Student performance will be tracked using district progress monitoring tools (FAST, Formative Assessments, ISIP, Dreambox) at scheduled intervals to assess growth in ELA and Math. Data will be disaggregated by subgroup to evaluate progress specifically for Black students.

- Instructional Walkthroughs & Observations: Principal and Curriculum Specialist will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs and formal observations using a targeted look-for tool focused on inclusive, differentiated, and diversity conscious teaching methods

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Keila Victor

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:

To address the achievement gap among Black students in Grades 3–5, we are implementing a combination of Tier 1 and Tier 2 evidence-based instructional interventions that are supported by strong research and aligned to student needs.

Rationale:

The rationale is grounded in the analysis of state assessment data, which showed significantly lower proficiency rates in ELA and Math for this subgroup compared to school-wide averages.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, 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

Collaborative Planning and Data Driven Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Principal Keila Victor

By When/Frequency:

ongoing

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

Teachers will engage in structured PLCs to analyze subgroup data, plan targeted instruction, and adjust strategies based on ongoing assessments. Teachers will provide scaffolded supports and plan ahead for differentiation. Monitoring: PLC agendas and student growth trends will be monitored monthly. In addition, Teacher-Student data chats and goal setting to include progress monitoring.

Action Step #2

Conduct Strategy Walks

Person Monitoring:

Keila Victor- Principal

By When/Frequency:

ongoing

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

Implement a structured cycle of strategy walks to monitor and strengthen the use of high-impact instructional practices aligned to the school's Area of Focus. Teacher leaders will actively participate in and co-facilitate these walks, model effective strategies, and support reflective debriefs. Data gathered from strategy walks will be used during PLCs and professional development to build teacher capacity, promote shared ownership, and ensure consistent implementation of best practices across classrooms.

Area of Focus #2

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)**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.

Standards-based data collected from the 2025-2026 school year showed students performing below grade level in Math, ELA, and Science with a lack of consistency in task aligned to grade-level appropriate standards. Students are not provided consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited teaching methods to support learning.

Specifically, schoolwide ELA proficiency was 78%, while Students with disabilities demonstrated 41 % proficiency. In Mathematics, schoolwide proficiency was 80%, compared to 53 % proficiency among Students with disabilities. These data points indicate a persistent and meaningful achievement gap that must be addressed to ensure equitable outcomes for all learners.

In response, targeted instructional practices, differentiated support, and intentional use of data-driven instruction will be prioritized to ensure that instruction meets the specific needs of Students with disabilities across all grade levels.

This Area of Focus was selected due to the clear disparity in performance trends and the need to accelerate growth through high-quality core instruction and systematic intervention supports.

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.

SWD Student Proficiency in ELA will increase from 41% to 83% or higher, as measured by State Progress Monitoring Assessment. SWD Student Proficiency in Math will increase from 53% to 85% or

higher, as measured by State Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Monitoring

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

Formative Assessments for each subject area Benchmark and Diagnostic Assessments for ELA and Math including- ISIP, Dreambox, Targeted Data Chats, ELFAC, Running Records, State Progress Monitoring Assessments, and Walk-through data. In addition, Progress monitoring and intervention adjustments: Monitor student response to intervention to make adjustments as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Keila Victor and Curriculum Specialist, Calysta Davis

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:

Ensure that small group instruction and 1:1 specially designed instruction are planned and implemented in alignment with evidence-based practices, intentionally targeting students' specific skill deficits to provide access to the general education curriculum. Explicit and direct instruction; multisensory approach to all learning; utilize a systematic approach for the delivery of instruction. In addition, frequent checks for understanding throughout the lesson accessing content.

Rationale:

Multi-sensory instruction uses visual, auditory, kinesthetic-tactile modalities in acquisition of reading skills. Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved; direct explanations and clearly explained skills comprises explicit instruction; teachers are clear, unambiguous, direct and visible- until students meet mastery. Systematic instruction includes breaking lessons into sequential and manageable steps that go from simple to complex skills.

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

Continue to strategically cluster students with disabilities into classrooms on academic level and IEP Goals, including inclusive scheduling to the maximum extent possible when in the best interest of students.

Person Monitoring:

Principal Keila Victor

By When/Frequency:

August- May

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

Provide opportunities for ESE and General Education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and the delivery of services. We will schedule regular collaborative planning sessions to support the alignment of instructional strategies and accommodations for students with exceptionalities. To monitor implementation and effectiveness, we will: Conduct periodic walkthroughs and classroom observations to look for evidence of co-planned differentiation. Review lesson plans for inclusion of IEP goals, accommodations, and modifications. Collect feedback from both ESE and General Ed teachers through surveys or reflective check-ins to assess collaboration and instructional impact.

Action Step #2

Conduct Strategy Walks

Person Monitoring:

Keila Victor, Principal

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

Implement a structured cycle of strategy walks to monitor and strengthen the use of high-impact instructional practices aligned to the school's Area of Focus. Teacher leaders will actively participate in and co-facilitate these walks, model effective strategies, and support reflective debriefs. Data gathered from strategy walks will be used during PLCs and professional development to build teacher capacity, promote shared ownership, and ensure consistent implementation of best practices across classrooms.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Standards-based data collected during the 2025–2026 academic year indicates that 24% of students are performing below grade level in Science, largely attributed to inconsistencies in the alignment of instructional tasks with grade-level standards.

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.

Proficiency in Science will increase 5% (from 76% to 81%), as measured by statewide assessments.

Monitoring

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

The school leadership team will monitor school-wide academic performance monthly as part of the school-based team meeting agenda rotation. School leaders will conduct weekly instructional walkthroughs using our schoolwide feedback form to provide guidance to support changes in instructional practices directly related to standards aligned instruction and school improvement plan strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Keila Victor and Curriculum Specialist, Calysta Davis

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:

Academic Discourse and Classroom Discussion is tightly aligned to daily standards and lesson focus. Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Rationale:

Classroom discussion is a method of teaching that involves the entire class in a discussion. The teacher stops lecturing and students get together as a class to discuss an important issue. Classroom discussions allow students to improve communication skills by voicing their opinions and thoughts. Teachers also benefit from classroom discussion as it allows them to see if students have learnt the concepts that are being taught. Moreover, a classroom discussion creates an environment where everyone learns from each other

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

Prioritize Evidence Based Questioning.

Person Monitoring:

Principal Keila Victor

By When/Frequency:

ongoing

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

Strengthen student inquiry skills through the implementation and monitoring of routine use of higher-level thinking through questioning, class discussions, problem solving activities, and/or

collaborative

study groups. The use of best practices are used to ensure equitable engagement and process for student interaction.

Action Step #2

Conduct Strategy Walks

Person Monitoring:

Principal Keila Victor

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

Implement a structured cycle of strategy walks to monitor and strengthen the use of high-impact instructional practices aligned to the school's Area of Focus. Teacher leaders will actively participate in and co-facilitate these walks, model effective strategies, and support reflective debriefs. Data gathered from strategy walks will be used during PLCs and professional development to build teacher capacity, promote shared ownership, and ensure consistent implementation of best practices across classrooms.

Area of Focus #4

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Standards based data collected in the 2025-2026 school year indicate that 22% of students are performing below grade level in ELA due to inconsistencies of tasks aligned to grade level standards. Our goal is to provide opportunities for learners to engage in standards aligned tasks with fidelity in order to see consistent academic gains across grade levels.

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.

Proficiency in ELA will increase 5% (from 78% to 83%), as measured by statewide assessments.

Monitoring

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

The school-based leadership team will monitor school-wide academic performance monthly as part of our school-based leadership team meeting agenda. School leaders will conduct weekly walkthroughs using our schoolwide feedback form to provide guidance and support changes in instructional practices related to standards aligned instruction as well as school improvement plan strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Keila Victor and Calysta Davis, Curriculum Specialist

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:

Continue developing a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards and NGSSS as an essential foundation for improving student outcomes through the intentional use of Flamingo, Lindamood-Bell, UFLI, and district-created benchmark and post-assessments.

Rationale:

Support students in developing proficiency with content standards through targeted, differentiated instruction using research-based programs, including Flamingo, Lindamood-Bell, and UFLI.

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

Instructional Support

Person Monitoring:

Keila Victor and Calysta Davis

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

Use state and district resources to deepen understanding of BEST ELA Standards and support backwards planning, targeted instruction, and data-based small groups. Provide ongoing feedback through ELA walkthroughs, strengthen explicit and systematic reading and writing instruction, ensure supports and extensions for all learners, and utilize ELA Champions to support curriculum implementation and student achievement.

Action Step #2

PLC and PD Support

Person Monitoring:

Keila Victor and Calysta Davis

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

Provide consistent PLC structures for teachers to collaboratively plan, analyze benchmark data and student work samples, and design scaffolded lessons that address learning gaps and guide small group instruction. Regularly attend PLCs to check in with teams, provide support, and help ensure instruction is aligned to student needs.

Action Step #3

Supporting Rigorous Tasks

Person Monitoring:

Keila Victor and Calysta Davis

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

Support rigorous tasks across classrooms by providing teachers with planning support, walkthrough feedback, and resources aligned to grade-level standards. Teachers will also plan extension activities to ensure tasks remain rigorous and appropriately challenging for all learners. The school will monitor the impact through classroom walkthroughs, PLC discussions, student work samples, and assessment data to determine how rigorous tasks are supporting student growth.

Action Step #4

Conduct Strategy Walks

Person Monitoring:Principal Keila Victor and Curriculum Specialist
Calysta Davis**By When/Frequency:**

ongoing

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

Implement a structured cycle of strategy walks to monitor and strengthen the use of high-impact instructional practices aligned to the school's Area of Focus. Teacher leaders will actively participate in and co-facilitate these walks, model effective strategies, and support reflective debriefs. Data gathered from strategy walks will be used during PLCs and professional development to build teacher capacity, promote shared ownership, and ensure consistent implementation of best practices across classrooms.

Action Step #5

Grade 3 Reading Acceleration Through Data-Driven Instruction and ALD-Aligned Tasks

Person Monitoring:

Keila Victor and Calysta Davis

By When/Frequency:

ongoing

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

By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, Grade 3 students will increase reading proficiency from current baseline data to at least 89% proficiency, as measured by FAST PM3. This goal will be achieved through the implementation of rigorous, standards-aligned instruction, targeted small group interventions, and intentional planning to meet the needs of all learners.

Teachers will utilize Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) during collaborative planning in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to design and implement differentiated tasks that align to grade-level standards and extend student thinking. Instruction will include the intentional development of extension activities for students performing at or above proficiency, ensuring tasks require higher-order thinking, complex text analysis, and evidence-based responses aligned to Levels 4 and 5 performance expectations.

For students approaching proficiency or in the lowest 25%, teachers will plan scaffolded instruction that builds toward grade-level rigor using ALDs to clearly define the progression of skills needed for mastery. Ongoing data analysis through PLCs, formative assessments, and progress monitoring tools will inform instructional adjustments and ensure that all students are consistently engaged in appropriately challenging and standards-based tasks.

The School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will monitor progress toward this goal monthly, with a focus on instructional alignment, the use of ALDs in lesson planning, and evidence of rigorous tasks

across classrooms. This systematic approach ensures equitable access to high-quality instruction and supports increased student achievement in Grade 3 reading.

Area of Focus #5

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Standards based data collected from the 2025-2026 school year still shows that 20 percent of students performing below grade level in Math due to inconsistencies of tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Deepen understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics and Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR's) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

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.

Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 5% (from 80% to 85%), as measured by statewide assessments.

Monitoring

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

The school leadership team will monitor school-wide academic performance monthly as part of the school-based team meeting agenda rotation. School leaders will conduct weekly instructional walkthroughs using our schoolwide feedback form to provide guidance to support changes in instructional practices directly related to standards aligned instruction and school improvement plan strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Keila Victor and Calysta Davis, Curriculum Specialist

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:

Backwards Planning

Rationale:

Shifting from stating a standard to communicating learning expectations ensures that goals are appropriate, challenging, and attainable. When goals are specific, revisited throughout the lesson and connect to other mathematics, they are clearer to students. Effective teaching of mathematics establishes clear goals for the mathematics that students are learning, situates goals within learning progressions, and uses the goals to guide instructional decisions. Effective Mathematics Teaching Practices (Principles to Actions, NCTM 2014)

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

Backwards Planning using the Effective Planning Protocol

Person Monitoring:

Principal Keila Victor

By When/Frequency:

ongoing

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

Teachers and administrators engage in Common Planning utilizing the PCS Effective Planning Protocol (T&L Handbook) and the Best Instructional Guide to Mathematics (B1G-M) to support implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Action Step #2

Conduct Strategy Walks

Person Monitoring:

Principal Keila Victor and Curriculum Specialist
Calysta Davis

By When/Frequency:

ongoing

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

Implement a structured cycle of strategy walks to monitor and strengthen the use of high-impact instructional practices aligned to the school's Area of Focus. Teacher leaders will actively participate in and co-facilitate these walks, model effective strategies, and support reflective debriefs. Data gathered from strategy walks will be used during PLCs and professional development to build teacher capacity, promote shared ownership, and ensure consistent implementation of best practices across classrooms.

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.

At the conclusion of the 2025–2026 school year, Midtown Academy’s risk ratio for Black/African American students receiving Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) was 3.21, as indicated by the Data Analytics Behavior Dashboard. This data reflects a significant disproportionality in disciplinary outcomes. Contributing factors include inconsistencies in cultural responsiveness and a need to strengthen staff capacity to effectively understand, interpret, and respond to diverse student backgrounds, behaviors, and communication styles. Addressing this area will require targeted professional learning, alignment of behavioral expectations, and implementation of equitable practices to ensure a supportive and inclusive school climate for all students.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, Midtown Academy will reduce the risk ratio for Black/African American students receiving Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) from 3.21 to 2.0 or below, as measured by the Data Analytics Behavior Dashboard. This goal reflects a commitment to decreasing disciplinary disproportionality through the implementation of equitable behavior practices, consistent monitoring of data, and targeted supports for students and staff.

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 school-based leadership team will engage in monthly monitoring of schoolwide academic performance as a standing agenda item during leadership team meetings. Behavior data will be reviewed and analyzed on a monthly basis during PLC data chats and PBIS committee meetings to inform responsive actions at the grade level and schoolwide.

School leaders will conduct weekly instructional walkthroughs to provide targeted, actionable feedback aligned to the implementation of PBIS interventions and supports. This includes a focus on restorative practices and high-impact instructional and behavioral strategies, such as those outlined in *Teach Like a Champion*, to ensure consistent and effective classroom practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Keila Victor, 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:

PBIS is an ongoing commitment to supporting students, educators, and families through systems change. When you implement PBIS well with heavy emphasis on culturally responsive elements, students experience improved behavioral, social, emotional, and academic outcomes, schools and programs reduce their use of exclusionary discipline practices and improve their overall climate

Rationale:

PBIS principles align with those of safe and successful schools, making it an intervention of choice in federal legislation. The PBIS Cultural Responsiveness 5-Point Intervention indicates that if culturally responsive elements are embedded into the PBIS school wide and classroom system, the problem would be reduced by establishing and maintaining positive relationships with all students thereby enhancing equity in student outcomes. Consistent implementation leading to internalization.

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

Positive Behavior Intervention Systems - Community Building

Person Monitoring:

Keila Victor, Principal

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

All classroom teachers will conduct daily morning meetings/community building circles or class meetings to establish a “culture of care” to focus on positive relationships, interactions, sharing class responsibilities, growing empathy, establishing use of “I” statements to express feelings, demonstrating and practicing active listening and use of affective language. Staff will utilize an inquiry stance to collect data on the state of relationships in their classrooms and identify small changes that can be made with individual students to increase trust and positive interactions

Action Step #2

Classroom Management incorporated with CARES

Person Monitoring:

Calysta Davis, Curriculum Specialist(s)

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

Connecting with families and stakeholders related to PBIS and Tier I Expectations. Communicate Tier I expectations and incentives/reinforcers with families and community stakeholders. - Post Tier I Expectation's (CARES) in high frequency areas including fence in carline and outside area near

playground. - Add Tier I Expectations to electronic marquee - Add CARES to SAC and PTA Agenda
Add Tier 1 Expectations and post PBIS Event dates throughout campus and to the school website.
Implement schoolwide consistency in the implementation of guidelines to success.

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.

The School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) engaged in a comprehensive analysis of state assessment data to identify priority areas and inform the strategic allocation of School Improvement funds. Funding decisions are intentionally aligned to support capacity building, targeted interventions, and the reduction of identified achievement gaps.

Implementation and progress toward identified goals will be systematically monitored through structured grade-level Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on each content area, as well as during monthly SBLT meetings where tiered academic and behavioral data are reviewed. The School Advisory Council (SAC) will participate in the review of funding allocations and provide stakeholder input to ensure transparency and alignment with schoolwide priorities.

Ongoing progress monitoring will occur through data cycles, ensuring that instructional adjustments and resource allocations remain responsive to student needs and contribute to continuous school improvement.

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).

To address the identified need in reading for students in the lowest 25%, the school will allocate targeted resources to support intensive literacy interventions and differentiated instruction. Analysis of FAST PM1 and PM2 data, as well as STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading assessments, indicates that students in the lowest quartile demonstrate significant deficits in foundational reading skills, including phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Resources will include evidence-based intervention programs, decodable texts, and supplemental literacy materials designed to strengthen foundational skills. The school will utilize intervention support personnel, including a certified teacher providing targeted small group instruction, and implement structured literacy strategies aligned to student needs. Professional development will focus on explicit instruction in phonics, guided reading, and strategies to increase student discourse and comprehension.

Implementation will begin in August and occur daily during designated Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention blocks. Students in the lowest 25% will receive targeted small group instruction with ongoing progress monitoring conducted biweekly using formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools. Data will be analyzed during grade-level PLC meetings to inform instructional adjustments.

The School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will review reading data monthly to monitor student growth, evaluate the effectiveness of interventions, and ensure fidelity of implementation. The School Advisory Council (SAC) will also review resource allocation and provide stakeholder input. This systematic and data-driven approach ensures that resources are aligned to student needs and that progress toward closing achievement gaps in reading is continuously monitored.

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