

Pinellas County Schools

RIDGECREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



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..... 6

 D. Early Warning Systems 7

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14

 E. Grade Level Data Review 17

III. Planning for Improvement..... 18

IV. Positive Learning Environment 32

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 34

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 39

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 40

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

Educate and prepare each student for college, career and life.

Provide the school's vision statement

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

Tracy Gardner

gardnert@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- monitor core instruction to include whole group and small group • provide feedback related to implementation of standards based curriculum • oversee school wide professional development related to writing across the content areas • monitor student achievement to ensure all students make adequate growth • conduct walk throughs, observations and evaluations • celebrate growth and progress toward goal attainment

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Stacey Peters

petersst@pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- monitor core instruction to include whole group and small group • provide feedback related to implementation of standards based curriculum • oversee school wide professional development related to PBIS • monitor achievement of our black/African American students and students with disabilities • conduct walk throughs, observations and evaluations • celebrate growth and progress toward goal attainment • oversee collaborative planning • create a plan and a timeline for science implementation • oversee mentoring program

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Lillian "Carole" Della Penna

dellapennal@pcsb.org

Position Title

MTSS Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- oversee tier 2 and tier 3 academic and behavior interventions • progress monitor students with disabilities and black/African American students • coach and provide feedback

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Carli McCrary

mccraryc@pcsb.org

Position Title

PELI Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- facilitate collaborative planning related to standards based instruction • support utilization of state and district ELA resources • monitor ELA data • coach and provide feedback

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Ursula Parker

parkeru@pcsb.org

Position Title

Behavior Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- Implement systems related to PBIS
- Progress monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior
- Coach and provide feedback

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.

In May 2026, our School Advisory Council (SAC) met to review our current data and discuss goals and initiatives for the upcoming school year. Additional school improvement planning took place with the school based leadership team. The instructional leadership team analyzed current data and reflected on our previous year's (2025-2026) SIP goals. We identified successes and challenges experienced throughout the school year that led to meeting, not meeting, and/or exceeding our SIP goals. It was determined that we will continue to focus on improving writing, implemented across content areas. With the school based leadership team input and our School Advisory Council, our school improvement plan was updated. We reflected extensively and brainstormed corrections and new strategies to meet our goals for the school 2026-2027 school year.

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)).

A strong and effective School Improvement Plan (SIP) hinges on a cyclical process of monitoring, analysis, stakeholder feedback, and revision.

1. Regular Monitoring

A. Data Collection • Formative Assessment– Weekly or unit-level checks (quizzes, exit tickets, curriculum embedded tasks) aligned with state standards • Interim/Benchmark Tests • Subgroup Data Disaggregation

B. Progress Meetings • Monthly Data Teams– Grade level teams and SIP teams will meet monthly to review outcomes, identify where students across subgroups underperform, and pinpoint instructional barriers. • Leadership Walkthroughs / Observations– Frequent classroom visits focused instructional priorities. Feedback is shared and tracked. • Tiered Intervention Tracking– Monitoring student participation and success in interventions • Attendance-Regular review (2x a month) of attendance through our Child Study Team

2. Stakeholder Feedback

A. Ongoing Listening Loops • Family Input– Bi monthly opportunities offered for families to meet with administration, annual PCSB Stakeholders Survey

B. Formal Feedback Points • Data Reviews– Teachers facilitate student led conferences between students and families • Parent–Teacher Conferences– Goes beyond grades to discussions of skill-levels, progress toward standards, and action steps for continued growth

3. Routine Analysis

A. Problem Solving Cycle

1. Identify Concern– A subgroup misses benchmarks or plateau in growth
2. Dig Into Root Causes– Teams employ tools like cause-effect charts or data digs (e.g., performance on specific standards or item types)
3. Adjust Strategies– Example: Shift from whole-class reteaching to targeted small-group
4. Implement & Monitor– Use mini-assessments to check whether the shift improves outcomes; continue if effective, adjust if needed.

B. Mid-Cycle & Whole-Cycle Adjustments • Mid-Year Revision– If benchmarks show ongoing shortfall, infusion of additional resources or shift in intervention intensity. • End-of-Year SIP Review– Reflect on progress: Did all students—including lowest-performing quartile—make accelerated gains? Use input from teachers, students, families. • Plan Refresh– Strategies removed that did not yield results; scale effective ones; set updated targets and measures for the following year

C. Ensuring Equity & Targeted Gains • Clear, Measurable Goals • Intervention Fidelity– Regular checks that interventions are delivered as designed • Targeted Resource Allocation– Redirect funding or staff time to efforts that show positive impact for historically underserved populations

All staff members will contribute as a member of a SIP committee. SIP committees meet monthly to review goals, action steps, and monitor progress toward goal attainment. Updates shared through weekly newsletters, email, faculty meetings and PLCs.

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	100.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	YES
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) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) 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: B 2024-25: B 2023-24: B 2022-23: A 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	28	41	54	64	49	75				311
Absent 10% or more school days	0	7	17	21	15	13				73
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	4	0	0				5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	4				4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	14	27	6	14				61
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	10	5	25	7	11				58
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	4	8						12
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	3	2	8	0					13

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	2	11	27	8	12				60

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	8	0	0				8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0				3

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	24	52	55	60	87	74				352
Absent 10% or more school days		20	9	12	17	19				77
One or more suspensions			2	2	1	2				7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				2	4	1				7
Course failure in Math				2	4	1				7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				15	12					27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		10	10	18	13	18				69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		4	8	2						14
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)			6	6	7					19

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		6	4	11	14	18				53

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				4						4
Students retained two or more times				1						1

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*	66	68	62	64	64	59	61	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	64	70	61	63	67	59	58	63	58
ELA Learning Gains	58	65	63	61	62	60	65	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46	63	58	68	59	56	47	62	57
Math Achievement*	67	72	66	65	69	64	59	66	62
Math Learning Gains	65	69	64	58	67	63	55	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43	56	50	31	56	51	34	58	52
Science Achievement	70	72	62	60	70	58	60	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						60%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students						No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target						1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI						479
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*
60%	59%	55%	63%	58%	57%	

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	31%	Yes	1	1
English Language Learners	64%	No		
Asian Students	98%	No		
Black/African American Students	51%	No		
Hispanic Students	59%	No		
Multiracial Students	52%	No		
White Students	77%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49%	No		

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

F	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	66%	64%	58%	46%	67%	65%	43%	70%					
	Students With Disabilities	20%		38%		35%	31%							
	English Language Learners	55%				73%								
	Asian Students	100%		90%		100%	100%							
	Black/African American Students	48%	36%	52%	59%	46%	60%	47%	60%					
	Hispanic Students	53%	50%	61%		65%	74%		50%					
	Multiracial Students	58%		39%		67%	44%							
	White Students	85%	90%	63%		80%	67%		79%					
	Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	48%	49%	43%	50%	54%	41%	59%					

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	64%	63%	61%	68%	65%	58%	31%	60%					
Students With Disabilities	42%	10%	63%		41%	36%		58%					
English Language Learners	58%				58%								
Asian Students	95%		78%		95%	78%		91%					
Black/African American Students	44%	48%	59%	61%	36%	40%	40%	21%					
Hispanic Students	58%	70%	52%		48%	33%							
Multiracial Students	58%	45%	60%		69%	80%		50%					
White Students	78%	77%	62%		85%	71%		83%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	53%	53%	62%	66%	50%	50%	34%	36%					

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	61%	58%	65%	47%	59%	55%	34%	60%					
Students With Disabilities	44%		47%		36%	53%		36%					
English Language Learners	53%		50%		47%	50%							
Asian Students	100%		92%		95%	69%							
Black/African American Students	35%	34%	60%	53%	23%	35%	35%	28%					
Hispanic Students	50%	27%	63%		56%	58%		45%					
Multiracial Students	67%		40%		62%	47%							
White Students	79%	81%	72%		82%	71%		84%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	45%	47%	56%	48%	39%	43%	34%	36%					

E. Grade Level Data Review – State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested or all tested students scoring the same.

2025-26 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	63%	68%	-5%	60%	3%
ELA	4	65%	66%	-1%	60%	5%
ELA	5	63%	66%	-3%	61%	2%
Math	3	61%	71%	-10%	66%	-5%
Math	4	74%	72%	2%	65%	9%
Math	5	58%	69%	-11%	62%	-4%
Science	5	64%	70%	-6%	60%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Most Improvement

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

Overall, our proficiency data increased in all content areas as compared to the 2025-2026 school year. When looking at our current data, science had the highest increase in proficiency compared to the previous year. The highest learning gains occurred within math. New actions taken included:

- collaborative planning sessions facilitated by our literacy coach with administrative support
- 1-2x a month district ISD math support with planning and coaching
- individual teacher and grade level data meetings

- 1-2x a month district ISD science support with planning and coaching
 - additional TDEs for teachers to support differentiation within small groups
 - increased student writing across content areas

Lowest Performance

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

Although an increase from last year, our L25 Math Learning Gains (44%) continues to show low performance.

We contribute this performance due to transition of VE resource teachers. This past year, three-four different staff members served in that role. Next year we should see gains in this area due to consistency.

Greatest Decline

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

L25 Learning Gains ELA (21% decrease)

ESE ELA Subgroup (26% decrease)

Inconsistent staffing for VE resource, lack of progress monitoring through the MTSS process and minimal interventions contributed to this decline. This year decreased staffing occurred for interventions due to providing supports to several high need students with IEPs in the primary

grades.

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.

Kindergarten math (41%) had the greatest gap compared to the state average (67%). While not a trend, the contributing factors consisted of losing a unit after the 10 day count, leading to increased class sizes and classroom management challenges. A teacher resignation mid year, also contributed to the gap in academic performance. The majority of students in kindergarten lacked consistent instruction this year.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Third grade consists of 27 students with two or more early warning indicators. This will be a focus during our school based leadership meetings to ensure we are addressing barriers to make learning accessible to children.

Highest Priorities

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

1. ESE subgroup ELA grades 3-5
2. ESE subgroup Math grades 3-5
3. L25 ELA and Math grades 4-5
4. kindergarten- grade 2 literacy

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 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.

The focal points were determined by the 2% increase in grades 3-5 proficiency, the 24 point decrease in ELA L25 learning gains, and the overall decrease in K-2 literacy as compared to the previous year.

1. Revisit Cognitive Engagement with Content from previous 24/25 school year: Activating prior knowledge, stimulating critical thinking, and deepening understanding of core content across the depth of knowledge will increase mastery and retention of concepts.
2. Continue to focus on Writing to Learn by building from strategies introduced 25/26 school year: Implementing writing strategies will promote active learning, provide tools to organize thoughts, create connections across content, and helps to expand student knowledge and interaction with complex academic concepts.
3. Incorporate Academic Discourse with increased intentionality: Academic discourse facilitates the exchange of student ideas, the development of academic vocabulary, and the growth of active listening skills to advance student engagement, promote authentic discussion, and increase comprehension of core content.

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 64% to 75% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

ELA 3-5 proficiency will increase from 66% to 75% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

ELA learning gains will increase from 58% to 65% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

ELA L25 learning gains will increase from 44% to 65% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Monitoring

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

Administrators and the school-based leadership team will progress monitor through weekly leadership meetings, walk throughs, observations, collaborative planning, and data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tracy Gardner

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:

Cognitive engagement with content for students through intentional planning and implementation of core instruction.

Rationale:

Research consistently shows that higher levels of cognitive engagement led to stronger academic achievement, improved retention of knowledge, and greater student motivation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**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

Strategy Walks with Feedback

Person Monitoring:

Tracy Gardner

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

The leadership team will perform targeted strategy walks with feedback, focusing on cognitive engagement, writing for impact, and academic discourse. Trend data will be analyzed to monitor impact.

Action Step #2

Writing for Impact: K-5 PLC using The Writing Revolution 2.0

Person Monitoring:**By When/Frequency:**

Tracy Gardner

8/2026-5/2027

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

Students will learn that their words can inform, persuade, inspire, entertain, and create positive change. Writing is transformed from a classroom task into a meaningful tool for communication, critical thinking, and real-world action.

Professional learning will occur monthly.

We will monitor the impact of this action step through targeted walk throughs, student writing samples, and district and state assessments.

Action Step #3

Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:

Tracy Gardner

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

ELA Champs will support their grade level team use of state and district resources (such as the BEST ELA Standards, PCS Gold Documents, ALDs, Pop-Up Padlets) to plan for instruction and monitor student progress. During collaborative planning, cognitive engagement with content, The Writing Revolution (TWR) strategies, and academic discourse will be incorporated.

Area of Focus #2

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.

The focal points were determined by the 2% increase in grades 3-5 proficiency, the 6% increase in learning gains, and 13% increase in L25 learning gains.

1. Revisit Cognitive Engagement with Content from previous 24/25 school year: Activating prior knowledge, stimulating critical thinking, and deepening understanding of core content across the depth of knowledge will increase mastery and retention of concepts.
2. Continue to focus on Writing to Learn by building from strategies introduced 25/26 school year: Implementing writing strategies will promote active learning, provide tools to organize thoughts, create connections across content, and helps to expand student knowledge and interaction with complex academic concepts.
3. Incorporate Academic Discourse with increased intentionality: Academic discourse facilitates the

exchange of student ideas, the development of academic vocabulary, and the growth of active listening skills to advance student engagement, promote authentic discussion, and increase comprehension of core content.

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.

Math 3-5 proficiency will increase from 67% to 75% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Math learning gains will increase from 65% to 75% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Math L25 learning gains will increase from 44% to 65% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Math K-2 proficiency will increase from 53% to 65% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Monitoring

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

Administrators and the school-based leadership team will progress monitor through weekly leadership meetings, walk throughs, observations, collaborative planning, and data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Stacey Peters

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:

Cognitive engagement with content for students through intentional planning and implementation of core instruction.

Rationale:

Research consistently shows that higher levels of cognitive engagement led to stronger academic achievement, improved retention of knowledge, and greater student motivation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

K-5 Grade Level PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Stacey Peters

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

Professional learning monthly will occur where writing strategies will be implemented across content areas. We will monitor the impact of this action step through targeted walk throughs, math journals, benchmark assessments and progress monitoring cycles.

Action Step #2

K-5 Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:

Stacey Peters

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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 Best Instructional Guide to Mathematics (B1G-M) to support Implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards and other instructional initiatives to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes. Continue to plan for students to deepen their understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards by representing problems multiple ways.

Action Step #3

Academic Discourse and Collaborative Conversations

Person Monitoring:

Stacey Peters

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

Academic Discourse and collaborative conversations allow for more clear and precise articulation of ideas, critical thinking, and promotes a deeper understanding of complex concepts. Staff will engage in professional learning related to increasing Academic Discourse and Collaborative Conversations within their instruction, aligned to MTR 4 (Engage in Discussions). The impact of this action step will be monitored through targeted walk throughs.

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.

The focal points were determined by the 10% increase in 5th grade science proficiency.

1. Revisit Cognitive Engagement with Content from previous 24/25 school year: Activating prior

knowledge, stimulating critical thinking, and deepening understanding of core content across the depth of knowledge will increase mastery and retention of concepts.

2. Continue to focus on Writing to Learn by building from strategies introduced 25/26 school year: Implementing writing strategies will promote active learning, provide tools to organize thoughts, create connections across content, and helps to expand student knowledge and interaction with complex academic concepts.

3. Incorporate Academic Discourse with increased intentionality: Academic discourse facilitates the exchange of student ideas, the development of academic vocabulary, and the growth of active listening skills to advance student engagement, promote authentic discussion, and increase comprehension of core content.

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.

Science proficiency will increase from 70% to 75% as measured by PM3 SSA.

Monitoring

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

Administrators will monitor core instruction through walk throughs and observations with a specific focus on cognitive engagement with the content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tracy Gardner

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:

Cognitive engagement with content for students through intentional planning and implementation of core instruction.

Rationale:

Improving science outcomes is not about doing more science-it is about ensuring strong thinking,

producing evidence, and clear reasoning.

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

Professional Learning: Ignite, Investigate, Inform

Person Monitoring:

Tracy Gardner

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

Through collaborative planning, rigor will be increased by requiring students to justify and provide multiple perspectives, investigate and analyze data, and provide written explanations and arguments.

Action Step #2

Science Lab

Person Monitoring:

Tracy Gardner

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

All students in kindergarten-5th grade will experience hands on science labs to include robotics and coding.

Area of Focus #4

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.

Cognitive engagement with content, including small group and 1:1 specially designed instruction, aligned with evidence-based practices. Focus on shifting students from passive learners to active thinkers.

SWD ELA proficiency and learning gains significantly declined from the previous school year.

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 ESE subgroup will increase from 16% to 60% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

ELA learning gains for the ESE subgroup will increase from 42%-60% as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment

Math proficiency for the ESE subgroup will increase from 26% to 60% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Math learning gains for the ESE subgroup will increase from 33% to 60% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Monitoring

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

Administrators and leadership team will monitor specially designed instruction through observations, fidelity checklists, and district/state assessments. Bi-weekly progress monitoring will occur. A visible data room will be created to increase transparency toward achieving goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Stacey Peters

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:

On going formative assessment with feedback for students

Rationale:

Ongoing formative assessment is essential for ESE students because it provides real-time data to adjust instruction, tracks progress for IEP goals, and builds student confidence through immediate feedback and self-advocacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Specially Designed Instructional Practices

Person Monitoring:

Carole Della Penna

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

Monitor implementation of specially designed instructional practice bi weekly.

Ensure scaffolding occurs as needed through push in support, small group, and 1:1 settings.

Monitoring for impact will occur through observations, walk through, and progress monitoring of data.

Action Step #2

Professional Learning High Leverage Practices connected to the 5 Essentials

Person Monitoring:

Stacey Peters

By When/Frequency:**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will engage in professional learning related to incorporating high leverage practices within Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction.

Area of Focus #5

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.

Cognitive engagement with content during core instruction and intentional planning for Tier 1 and Tier 2 small groups, with a focus on shifting students from passive learners to active thinkers.

Black/African American students in grade 3 declined 12% in ELA proficiency as compared to the previous school year. Learning gains in grades 4 and 5 also declined.

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 for the Black/African American subgroup will increase from 36% to 60% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

ELA proficiency for the Black/African American subgroup will increase from 48% to 60% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

ELA learning gains for the Black/African American subgroup will increase from 53% to 65% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

ELA L25 learning gains for the Black/African American subgroup will increase from 59% to 65% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Monitoring

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

Administrators and leadership team will monitor core instruction and small groups through observations, walk throughs, and analyzing district/state assessments. Bi-weekly progress monitoring will occur. A visible data room will be created to increase transparency toward achieving goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tracy Gardner

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:

Cognitive engagement with content during core instruction and intentional planning for Tier 1 and Tier 2 small groups, with a focus on shifting students from passive learners to active thinkers.

Rationale:

Research consistently shows that higher levels of cognitive engagement led to stronger academic achievement, improved retention of knowledge, and greater student motivation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Walk to Read Intervention Grade 3

Person Monitoring:

Carole Della Penna

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

ELFAC data will be analyzed and used to create small groups. Instruction will be differentiated to meet the needs of students.

Action Step #2

Flexible Seating

Person Monitoring:

Carole Della Penna

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

Teachers and students will experiment with flexible seating options to support increased engagement with content.

Action Step #3

Collaborative Planning and Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Carole Della Penna

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

During collaborative planning, ELA Champs will support their grade level team use of state and district resources (such as the BEST ELA Standards, PCS Gold Documents, ALDs, Pop-Up Padlets) to plan for instruction and monitor student progress. While planning, a special focus will be placed on cognitive engagement with content, incorporating The Writing Revolution (TWR) strategies, and student academic discourse.

Area of Focus #6

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

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

Improve Kindergarten through Grade 2 Literacy Skills

PM3 K-2 FAST data declined from the previous school year.

Kindergarten 46% proficient

1st grade 52% proficient

2nd grade 50% proficient

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.

K-2 ELA proficiency will increase from 49% to 65% as measured by PM3 FAST assessment.

Monitoring

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

the desired outcome.

Monitoring of progress will occur monthly. Administration and the PELI coach will monitor ELFAC, STAR, ISIP, and module assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tracy Gardner

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:

UFLI and intentional small groups

Rationale:

Evidence shows the UFLI (University of Florida Literacy Initiative) Foundations program is a highly effective, evidence-based Structured Literacy curriculum. When paired with small group instruction, it allows teachers to differentiate, target specific skill deficits, and provide the intense repetition necessary for struggling readers and students with disabilities to master foundational phonics concepts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Strategy Walks with Feedback

Person Monitoring:

Carli McCrary

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

Walk throughs will be conducted with feedback weekly. Trend data will be analyzed, supporting adjustments to instructional practices.

Action Step #2

Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:

Carli McCrary

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

Weekly collaborative planning led by the PELI coach with administrative support.

Action Step #3

ELA Champs

Person Monitoring:

Tracy Gardner

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

ELA Champs to lead professional learning for K-2 staff. ELA Champs will support their grade level team use of state and district resources. During collaborative planning, cognitive engagement with content, The Writing Revolution (TWR) strategies, and academic discourse will be incorporated.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Multiple Early Warning Signs

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.

27 (45%) incoming third grade students demonstrate two or more early warning indicators, which is significant compared to other grade levels. The early warning indicators consist of level 1 academics, suspensions, and attendance concerns.

Measurable Outcome

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

We will decrease the amount of third grade students with two or more early warning signs by 50% going from 45% to 22%.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored weekly by the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) and the Child Study Team (CST).

Ongoing monitoring will demonstrate accountability to meet the academic, behavioral, and attendance needs of our students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Carole Della Penna

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:

Student Agency: Goal Setting, Behavior Contracts, Attendance Contracts

Rationale:

Research shows that elementary student agency—empowering learners to direct their own education, voice, and choices—improves academic performance, resilience, and engagement. Key evidence highlights that when students set personal goals and use self-assessment tools, they gain a clearer understanding of their learning progression.

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

Student Service Intervention

Person Monitoring:

Carole Della Penna

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-8/2027

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

The school based leadership team will identify and target students with two or more early warning indicators. Barriers to learning (academic, behavior, attendance) will be addressed as the school based leadership team develops a plan to help the student and/or family access appropriate supports. On going progress monitoring will occur bi-weekly.

Action Step #2

Student Agency

Person Monitoring:

Carole Della Penna

By When/Frequency:

8/2026-5/2027

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

With the support from a trusted adult, the identified students will set academic, behavioral and/or attendance goals. Students will monitor progress toward meeting their goal. Students will be empowered to share their progress to staff and their families.

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.

Ridgecrest Elementary School will maintain a system to provide parent resources, as well as inform others of their availability. We are working together with parents to update phone numbers and email contacts in Focus. We work with teachers to support teacher-parent communication via Teacher Parent conferences (minimum of 1 documented in person / phone per semester), email, Daily Student Agenda planners, and Parent Communication folders. Furthermore, Ridgecrest Elementary will inform parents regarding parent resources provided to them during our Annual Title I Meeting, through the school newsletter, Focus, and our website. Student led conferences will be offered throughout the year to allow parents to review their child(ren)'s academic and behavior data, as well as work with their child(ren) to set and review goals. Student led conferences not only provide opportunities to review student growth but also allows families to celebrate achievements and accomplishments. Ridgecrest Elementary will maximize parental involvement and participation in their children's education by arranging school meetings and events at a variety of times, or conducting in-home conferences between teachers or other educators, who work directly with participating children, and with parents who are otherwise unable to attend those conferences at school. <https://www.pcsb.org/ridgecrest-es>

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)).

Ridgecrest Elementary School will provide information to parents regarding Title I programs in a timely manner using various methods of communication including meetings, letters home, Focus, email and the school website. At the Annual Title I Meeting / Back to School Open House, information about Title I programs, curriculum, and academic assessments will be shared in a general meeting. During the parents' classroom visit, teachers will provide additional information on the subjects they teach, as well as share the Pinellas County Schools Student Expectations, use of embedded Social Emotional Learning skills, formative and standardized assessment plans and how parents can assist at home. The information will also be provided in the students' opening day packets, sent home on the first day of school, and documented in the Student Agendas. Teachers will maintain sign-in sheets and provide a copy to the administration / Title I Audit Box coordinator who will also maintain documentation on the dissemination of information, distribution methods, and timelines. Parents will be provided a survey to complete to provide input or to ask questions. The principal will respond by email or phone call to all questions left. If a parent is unsatisfied with the school-wide program plan, they will be asked to provide their comments to the principal who will then provide the comments to the Title I office. Further communication will occur through the use of weekly School Newsletters, SAC Meetings, reminders in agendas, Focus, advertisement of events on the school marquee, posting info on the website, and distribution and displaying of flyers for parent convenience.

<https://www.pcsb.org/ridgecrest-es>

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)).

Within team PLCS, the focus will be on standards based learning, data analysis and collaborative planning. The team will progress monitor and make the necessary changes needed to continue growth towards proficiency with intentionality. There will be a heavy emphasis on implementation of an effective Tier 1 PBIS plan. A positive school culture provides safe, supportive, encouraging, and inviting environments for all stakeholders, which in turn allows students' academic achievement to evolve. Involving all stakeholders in creating processes, clearly defining and teaching expectations is critical. Our team will continue to link our PBIS School wide initiatives to these events to increase awareness and strengthen the connection between home and school. We will continue to effectively use data to progress monitor (ILT, SAC and staff) so that the goals of increasing student academic performance, safety, and establishing positive school climates can be achieved.

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)).

Our partnership with our local churches and organizations that provide additional support to our families who are in need continues this year. These organizations offer both food and other academic materials for our staff and scholars. Our Family and Community liaison continues to recruit and retain mentor support for targeted students across all grade levels for academic support or through our lunch pal program. These community partnerships strengthen the bond between school and community, better equipping our students for academic success.

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)).

Through weekly SBLT meetings (including student services), our team will identify barriers to student learning and address student needs using a multi tiered system of support. A mentoring program is also in place, providing additional support.

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)).

The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) model aligns resources in schools for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs. The MTSS model addresses both academic and behavior needs of students through instruction and interventions developed to meet those needs. The problem solving/response to intervention (PS/RtI) component of MTSS is required in Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004). In an effective Multi-Tiered System of Supports: learning is accelerated to close gaps and prevent new ones; fewer students are at risk over time; decisions about who needs additional support can be made rapidly; rates of intervention success are high; and goals are defined in terms of improved achievement. The school based MTSS coach is used to support the framework by facilitating or modeling the components of MTSS: provide opportunities to practice problem-solving skills; provide collaborative / performance feedback to staff; develop coaching activities based on PD feedback, implementation fidelity; and student outcomes.

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)).

Professional learning will take place through monthly PLCs where we will use, The Writing Revolution 2.0 to improve instruction. We have an onsite mentor program for new teachers. All teams meet weekly for collaborative planning and/or PLCs. Through establishing a culture of collaboration, teachers will feel supported; therefore, improving teacher retention rates.

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)).

Title I funds continue to support the full day three-year old program at select elementary school allowing the district to provide continuity of service for a full two years in early childhood prior to entering kindergarten. This seamless, two-year programming provides a strong foundation for school readiness and future educational success. This leads to a smooth transition between preschool and kindergarten for both scholars and parents. Families are familiar with the personnel, environment, rules, and safety procedures.

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.

No Answer Entered

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).

No Answer Entered

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