

Pinellas County Schools

EAST LAKE HIGH 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..... 5
 - D. Early Warning Systems 6
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 9
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 10
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 11
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 12
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 13
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 16
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 17
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 37
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 41
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 44
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 45

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 community of East Lake High School will develop productive and responsible students who are prepared for post-secondary education, the workforce and citizenship.

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

Eric C. Smith, Ph.D.

smithericc@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Russell Denton

dentonr#pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #3**Employee's Name**

Shawn Anderson

andersonshaw@pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #4**Employee's Name**

Lincoln Yates

yatesl@pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #5**Employee's Name**

Jennifer Napier

napierj@pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

2. Stakeholder Involvement

Describe the process for involving stakeholders [including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders] and how their input was used in the SIP development process (20 U.S.C. §

6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

Stakeholder feedback was obtained through various methods during the school year to inform the development of the 2026–27 School Improvement Plan (SIP). For students, this included the school climate survey, student body surveys, and ongoing input from student leadership (student government). Parent feedback was collected through the school climate survey and the School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. Staff perspectives were captured through schoolwide surveys, small-group discussions with teacher leaders (school-based leadership team), the administrative team, and collaborative summer school improvement planning work. This collective input shaped our 3 schoolwide strategic priorities for 2026-27: 1. Growing the Nest (enrollment, recruitment, marketing, student experience) 2. Measuring Mastery (grading practices and assessment) 3. Cultivating Student Ownership (conditions for learning, metacognition, active learning) These priorities guided the creation of specific action steps for the school year. Final feedback from departments was gathered during summer planning sessions to confirm each department’s commitment to their targeted action steps, all centered around our core focus areas.

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)).

Our strategic priorities and corresponding action steps will be fully integrated into our daily practices and aligned across all meetings and professional development opportunities. This includes faculty and department meetings, PLCs, SBLT, and administrative team weekly meetings. These priorities will be revisited multiple times each month in collaboration with leadership teams and PLCs to evaluate progress and identify next steps. Daily classroom walkthroughs will serve as a key tool to assess implementation, inform adjustments to action steps, and determine whether additional support is needed—either system-wide or at the individual teacher level. Recognizing that this is a dynamic process, we will remain responsive, making ongoing refinements based on data analysis, collaboration with school-based leaders, and stakeholder input. Additionally, strategically designed school-based (job embedded) professional development will guide growth and progress throughout the school year.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	SENIOR HIGH 9-12
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	23.4%
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) 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: A 2024-25: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: A

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

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.

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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
	9	10	11	12	
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 Algebra assessment					0

Current Year (2026-27)

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL				TOTAL
	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators					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
	9	10	11	12	
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 Algebra assessment					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
	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators					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
	9	10	11	12	
Retained students: current year					0
Students retained two or more times					0

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	64	62	75	62	59	71	55	55
Grade 3 ELA Achievement									
ELA Learning Gains	65	59	59	64	58	58	62	57	57
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66	55	55	60	54	56	58	55	55
Math Achievement*	70	54	52	57	46	49	61	42	45
Math Learning Gains	61	49	45	53	45	47	53	46	47
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57	44	44	39	43	49	47	41	49
Science Achievement	88	77	74	85	73	72	83	64	68
Social Studies Achievement*	89	77	76	86	74	75	87	70	71
Graduation Rate	99	95	94	99	94	92	98	92	90
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration	87	73	74	77	69	69	76	69	67
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					50	52		45	49

*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						76%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students						No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target						0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI						763
Total Components for the FPPI						10
Percent Tested						97%
Graduation Rate						99%
ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
76%	70%	69%	76%	68%	61%	

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	60%	No		
English Language Learners	66%	No		
Asian Students	84%	No		
Black/African American Students	70%	No		
Hispanic Students	73%	No		
Multiracial Students	85%	No		
White Students	77%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	71%	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 PROGR
All Students	78%		65%	66%	73%	61%	57%	88%	89%		99%	87%	
Students With Disabilities	50%		56%	55%	53%	60%	58%	69%	51%		100%	52%	
English Language Learners	39%		68%	65%	57%	63%	62%	64%	74%		96%	71%	
Asian Students	88%		75%		83%	50%		85%	100%		100%	90%	
Black/African American Students	79%		73%	79%	64%	46%	33%	89%	58%		100%	82%	
Hispanic Students	70%		61%	65%	66%	57%	60%	88%	86%		97%	81%	
Multiracial Students	91%		66%		83%	71%		95%	93%		100%	80%	
White Students	79%		65%	63%	76%	63%	61%	88%	91%		99%	88%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	68%		69%	73%	64%	54%	55%	81%	76%		98%	71%	

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 PROGR
All Students	75%		64%	60%	57%	53%	39%	85%	86%		99%	77%	75%
Students With Disabilities	37%		53%	47%	26%	39%	36%	50%	62%		98%	35%	
English Language Learners	42%		58%	63%	38%	46%	53%	60%	57%		100%	51%	75%
Asian Students	83%		63%		67%			92%	95%		100%	85%	
Black/African American Students	52%		55%	50%	34%	36%		63%	100%		100%	63%	
Hispanic Students	73%		66%	58%	52%	53%	48%	84%	77%		98%	65%	70%
Multiracial Students	83%		66%		71%	56%		78%	75%		100%	75%	
White Students	76%		63%	62%	59%	54%	38%	87%	87%		100%	81%	80%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	62%		58%	53%	42%	47%	36%	71%	79%		100%	65%	72%

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 PROGR
All Students	71%		62%	58%	61%	53%	47%	83%	87%		98%	76%	58%
Students With Disabilities	31%		45%	34%	30%	41%	45%	49%	67%		95%	33%	
English Language Learners	41%		57%	52%	37%	34%	36%	63%	50%		96%	70%	58%
Asian Students	70%		61%		86%	55%		73%	100%		100%	85%	
Black/African American Students	42%		45%	24%	41%	38%	40%	59%	75%		100%	64%	
Hispanic Students	69%		62%	67%	52%	52%	33%	75%	84%		98%	73%	48%
Multiracial Students	73%		71%	60%	75%	48%		85%	89%		100%	79%	
White Students	73%		62%	60%	63%	55%	53%	86%	88%		98%	76%	80%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	63%		58%	57%	52%	46%	39%	76%	83%		97%	57%	50%

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	9	78%	63%	15%	60%	18%
ELA	10	78%	62%	16%	61%	17%
Biology	9	92%	82%	10%	87%	5%
Biology	10	64%	49%	15%	60%	4%
Algebra	9	72%	44%	28%	41%	31%
Algebra	10	55%	29%	26%	31%	24%
Geometry	9	81%	74%	7%	75%	6%
Geometry	10	55%	46%	9%	40%	15%
Geometry	11	28%	24%	4%	26%	2%
History	10	94%	89%	5%	76%	18%
History	11	89%	72%	17%	75%	14%
Biology	11	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Geometry	12	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
History	9	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
History	12	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				

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?

Algebra and Geometry both drastically improved totaling 69 pts from 57. Algebra scored a 67 which was the highest score in the Tampa Bay region while geometry scored 71. Strategic actions taken to improve this area include (but not limited to) intentional PLC/common planning, standards-based grading, consistent instructional feedback, standard tracking.

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 mathematics showed significant improvement, it remained our lowest-performing data component overall. Geometry, particularly student learning gains, continues to present the greatest opportunity for growth. Last year's performance was impacted by instructional inconsistencies and gaps in students' foundational math skills. The trend is positive, with strong year-over-year gains in both Algebra and Geometry and continued focus on targeted instruction and progress monitoring is expected to sustain this growth.

Greatest Decline

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

All categories had growth in 2025-2026. ELA gains had the smallest amount of growth from 64 to 65.

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.

Each posted cell in 2025-2026 is above the state average.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Gains in both ELA and math will be a priority in 2026-2027.

Acceleration, ensuring our senior cohort maximizes accelerated opportunities and a strategic plan is in place for each cohort.

Highest Priorities

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

Acceleration

Gains for both ELA and math need to increase

ELA needs to live in 80% proficiency

Biology and US History need to live in 90%

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 English Language Arts component for school improvement in grades 9 and 10 remains shy of 100% proficiency, with approximately only 65% of students making learning gains from scores in the year prior on the PM3 state assessment. ELA goals will focus on refining systems and increasing support towards the mastery of grade-level standards for all students in grades 9 and 10 who are required to sit for the PM3 assessment.

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.

During the 25-26 school year, ELA students in grades 9 and 10 were a combined 78% proficient, with whole-school learning gains at 65% and L25 learning gains at 66%. For the 26-27 school year we expect our ELA students in grades 9 and 10 to achieve a combined score of 82% proficient, with learning gains of 70% for the whole school including the L25 subgroup.

Monitoring

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

Monitoring Tools:

- FAST ELA PM1 and PM2
- Common formative assessments
- PLC meetings
- Peer and administrative walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Russell Denton

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 progress will be monitored through the use of various common formative assessments that are aligned to benchmarks and foundational literacy skills. State, district and teacher created assessments will provide checkpoints to assess student fluency, grammar, and comprehension to provide data on student achievement and potential learning gaps.

Rationale:

Data from various assessments will inform instruction and create opportunities to scaffold and/or remediate areas of concern, or reinforce benchmarks where performance is not proficient. These assessments will guide both whole-group and single student remediation efforts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

CST and MTSS meetings will be utilized to identify students with chronic absenteeism or repeated behavioral concerns that impact student attendance. Input and support from ELA teachers (in addition to other staff members) will be sought through the process.

Rationale:

Staff meeting regularly to discuss targeted student concerns around missed instructional time can lead to communication, collaboration, action, support, and creative solutions to increase student attendance, engagement, and performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Common planning and PLC protocols will be used with the various ELA groups teaching grades 9 and 10 to drive core instruction, create formative assessments, and discuss student concerns.

Rationale:

Focused and intentionally schedule planning and PLC time will allow for collaboration and peer review of professional practice and student work, and support efforts to identify achievement gaps and create plans to increase proficiency and ensure gains for all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Common Planning & PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Russell Denton

By When/Frequency:

Weekly/Bi-Weekly

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

Grade 10 English 2 teachers will meet for weekly Common Planning sessions, while Grade 9 English 1 and 2 teachers and Grade 10 English 3 teachers will meet for Bi-weekly PLCs. AP English Composition Grade 10 teachers will have quarterly PLCs. Administration will be present at each meeting, with a meeting calendar and agenda published in advance to allow for support (strategy/instructional idea generation), collaboration (formative assessment creation), review (data evaluation/attendance monitoring) and planning (notetaking/reading procedure implementation).

Action Step #2

Common Assessments / Monitoring Data to Ensure Gains

Person Monitoring:

Russell Denton

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

ELA teachers will utilize state, district and teacher-created formative assessments as testing windows/pacing guides dictate, to ensure all students are tracking to make learning gains and benchmarks of concern can be addressed at a whole-group or individual level in recurring fashion, with action taken to remediate or support in real time.

Action Step #3

Feedback, Coaching, and Professional Development

Person Monitoring:

Russell Denton

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

District and site-based walks with administration and/or instructional staff to identify, monitor, and support best practices and SIP goals. Walkthroughs will monitor pacing, note-taking and text-marking procedures, the reading comprehension protocol, appropriate levels of rigor, collaborative strategies, opportunities for metacognition/reflection, and overall student engagement. District and site based professional development will be offered around core instruction, standards-based grading, collaborative strategies, comprehensive reading strategies, and incorporating metacognitive reflection into lessons/units.

Action Step #4

Remediation and Tutoring

Person Monitoring:

Russell Denton

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

The ELA team will develop a comprehensive plan to identify students who are struggling with critical skills/benchmarks to engage in remediation and support via ELP in targeted small group and/or one-on-one reteaching or guided practice. Additionally, bootcamps to remediate struggling skills/

benchmarks may be added in the lead up to the EOC as prep prior to end of year testing.

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 Mathematics component of the school grade indicates an opportunity for growth in Geometry and Algebra 1. As a result, the Math goal will focus on increasing student proficiency and accelerating learning gains through high-quality instruction, ongoing progress monitoring, and targeted intervention.

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.

Increase Geometry proficiency from 71% to 77% by May 2027, and increase Algebra 1 proficiency from 67% to 71%, as measured by BEST Algebra 1 EOC exam.

Monitoring

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

This area of focus will be monitored through biweekly Math PLCs in tested subjects, where collaborative data analysis and instructional planning drive instructional decisions to improve student proficiency and learning gains. Additional monitoring will include instructional walkthroughs, common formative assessments, district common assessments, and ongoing data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jennifer Napier

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

The Math team will engage in weekly common planning and biweekly PLCs to analyze student data, monitor progress, and refine instructional practices. Formative assessments will be used regularly to

identify areas of need and provide timely scaffolding, remediation, and targeted support.

Rationale:

A consistent cycle of measuring mastery, analyzing student evidence, and responding through instruction ensures that instructional decisions are driven by student learning. Teachers will review progress monitoring data, analyze common formative assessments and student work to identify remediation of priority standards, provide timely instructional responses, and monitor the impact of targeted intervention and differentiated instruction on student growth and proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Targeted small-group instruction/rotations will be driven by evidence of student mastery gathered through common formative assessments, classroom formative assessment practices, and continuous progress monitoring. Flexible groups/rotations will be formed based on identified learning needs and will focus on addressing specific skill gaps through differentiated instruction, timely feedback, and evidence-based instructional strategies. Student progress will be monitored regularly, and instructional plans will be adjusted collaboratively through PLCs to accelerate learning and increase proficiency.

Rationale:

Schoolwide math data indicate a need to accelerate student growth through timely, targeted instructional responses. Instructional responses include standards-based reteaching of priority benchmarks, flexible small group instruction/rotations, targeted interventions during ELP, strategic regrouping of students based on mastery. Targeted small-group instruction enables teachers to address identified misconceptions, differentiate instruction, and provide immediate feedback based on student learning needs. This evidence-based approach supports increased learning gains and proficiency.

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

Common Planning / PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Math teachers will engage in weekly common planning and bi-weekly Mathematics PLCs to measure student mastery of priority standards, analyze common assessment and student work data, and identify instructional responses based on evidence of student learning. Teams will collaboratively monitor student progress, target standards requiring additional support, and implement timely

reteaching and interventions to accelerate learning gains and improve Geometry proficiency.

Action Step #2

Instructional Support & Coaching

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, Ongoing

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

School and district instructional leaders will conduct regular instructional walkthroughs to provide timely feedback and coaching. Walkthroughs will focus on evidence-based instructional practices, measuring student mastery, and responsive instruction. Trends will be used to celebrate effective practices, guide coaching, and support continuous improvement.

Action Step #3

Measuring Mastery Through Common Assessment Data

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Bi-Weekly

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

The Math team will use evidence of student learning to identify priority standards, implement targeted reteaching and intervention, and strategically utilize district programs and common assessment data to accelerate learning gains and increase Geometry proficiency.

Action Step #4

Targeted Intervention and Academic Support

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

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

The Math team will use evidence of student mastery to identify students requiring additional support and provide additional targeted intervention during ELP through flexible small-group instruction and district instructional resources. Instructional support will focus on priority standards and individual learning needs identified through ongoing progress monitoring. As the Cycle Assessments and EOC assessment approaches, teachers will provide standards-based spiral review sessions and targeted bootcamp opportunities to reinforce learning, provide meaningful feedback, and empower students to monitor their progress toward mastery as they prepare for success on the geometry assessments.

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.

East Lake achieved its highest science proficiency rates to date in 2025-2026, demonstrating

sustained growth along with strong instructional practices reaching 88% achievement. The next step is to increase proficiency to 90% or higher, positioning East Lake alongside the highest-performing schools in Florida. Reaching this benchmark reflects our commitment to continuous improvement and excellence in science instruction while reinforcing our status as an elite top-performing school.

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.

East Lake science proficiency reached 88% in the 25/26 school year. The improvement goal for 2026-2027 is to reach 90% as measured by the Florida Biology EOC

Monitoring

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

- Quarterly cycle assessments
- District provided Checks for understanding / mini assessments
- Standards trackers
- Classroom walk-throughs by peers and instructional leaders
- District created Mock EOC in quarter 4 prior to administration of state assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Shawn Anderson

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

The Science/Biology team will engage in collaborative planning through Professional Learning Community (PLC) protocols to analyze student performance data, identify instructional priorities, and design differentiated instruction aligned to Science Benchmarks and district-provided professional learning will be embedded throughout the school year to strengthen standards-based instructional practices and data-driven decision making. Teachers will administer common formative assessments and quarterly cycle assessments, using the results to adjust instruction, provide targeted intervention and enrichment, monitor student learning, and increase proficiency on district cycle assessments, the Mock EOC and final Biology EOC.

Rationale:

Data from numerous sources is invaluable to instruction. State, district and teacher created assessments provide numerous checkpoints for teachers to gauge student learning and implement a spiral reteaching plan to reinforce previously learned standards and for student mastery of science benchmarks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:**Rationale:****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

Collaborative Planning /Focused planning

Person Monitoring:

Shawn Anderson

By When/Frequency:

Weekly/Monthly

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

Weekly collaborative planning, with time utilized to collaborate, discuss instructional strategies, and problem-solve around current lessons, upcoming units, and future instruction. Monthly Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings will focus on Bubble Students, analyzing district data to identify trends, monitor student progress, and adjust instruction. Teachers will also review student work samples and mini-unit assessment data to inform future spiral re-teaching throughout the school year. During collaborative planning, teachers will integrate Biology Brain Builders to strengthen students' ability to analyze and respond to stimulus-based questions. Instruction will incorporate Scientific Thinking Protocols to deepen student reasoning and critical thinking, while Leading with the Lab will serve as the instructional framework to anchor learning through inquiry and hands-on experiences. Students will regularly engage in higher-order thinking questions and tasks that require them to analyze, evaluate, and justify their thinking.

Action Step #2

Reading and text decoding support

Person Monitoring:

Shawn Anderson

By When/Frequency:

weekly/monthly

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

Teachers will provide flexible small-group instruction based on assessment data and instructional needs. As the Biology EOC is heavily dependent on reading, teachers will incorporate literacy strategies using intentional vocabulary instruction, close reading of scientific texts and graphic organizers.

To assist levels 1 and 2 readers, language development will include collaborative learning structures, visual supports and vocabulary routines to encourage retention of knowledge. Additional supports will be available for English language learners as appropriate including English language dictionaries and visual representations. Biology teachers will work pro-actively to support students who show continued struggle with benchmarks and support them through ELP in targeted small group and/or

one-on-one reteaching/guided practice.

Area of Focus #4

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

East Lake's current performance in Social Studies was 89% as evidenced by the U.S. History EOC. Continued growth in US History will be fostered through collaborative planning focused on the implementation of regular data driven review and remediation, enhancing the student experience, and implementing the Five Essentials of Effective Instruction. Teachers will plan collaboratively for opportunities to enhance conditions for learning and expand metacognitive and active learning practices within the classroom. We will create engaging and supportive classrooms that foster critical thinking, resilience, and self-directed learners.

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.

The percent of students achieving proficiency on the US History EOC will increase from 89% to 90%.

Monitoring

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

Monitoring will occur through benchmark assessments, district-provided cycle assessments, and the use of common formative assessment trackers and data dashboards. Mr. Yates and the US History team will monitor students for meeting proficiency and engage in targeted intervention with the students who are performing below proficiency by monitoring assessment data and early warning indicators such as attendance, grades, and prior year assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Lincoln Yates

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:

We will increase academic support for students who are not meeting proficiency expectations via instruction that is anchored in the Five Essentials of Effective Instruction, review and remediation activities, and implementing engaging, project-based and active learning/experiential activities.

Rationale:

We want our students to continue to grow as critical thinking, resilient, and self-directed learners, therefore we will plan for engaging, project-based, experiential learning opportunities in the classroom and social studies learning lab. These interventions will be monitored through benchmark trackers, district assessment data monitoring, student presentations, student reflections, bell-work, and other classroom assessments.

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

Ongoing review and remediation

Person Monitoring:

Lincoln Yates

By When/Frequency:

Throughout the year

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

Targeted review sessions will be implemented for all students, particularly to students scoring level 2 or below on previous benchmark and cycle assessments. Teachers will incorporate spiraled review activities throughout the year, utilizing benchmark-aligned activities. Students will be assigned to pull out remediation groups based on formative and cycle assessment data and provided with scaffolded, vocabulary rich instruction, primary source analysis, and structured academic discussions to build background knowledge and critical thinking.

US History teachers and Mr. Yates will identify students who are in need of targeted intervention and implement intervention strategies such as: communicating/meeting with students and parents, adjusting schedules, small group tutoring and remediation sessions, and incentives for improvement and growth toward academic, attendance, or behavior goals.

Action Step #2

Enhancing the student experience

Person Monitoring:

Lincoln Yates

By When/Frequency:

Throughout the year

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

US History teachers will plan for experiential, metacognitive, and project-based learning activities that take place in the social studies learning lab, for all students to engage in.

Action Step #3

Integrate the Five Essentials of Effective Instruction in all social studies classrooms

Person Monitoring:

Lincoln Yates

By When/Frequency:

Throughout the year

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

Teachers will engage in lesson planning during PLCs that incorporate the Five Essentials of Effective Instruction and include high-yield protocols in US History classes for document analysis, making historical connections, historical thinking, and historical contextual discussion.

Area of Focus #5

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

Graduation/Acceleration specifically relating to Acceleration

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.

Our acceleration rate is the only whole-school data cell that decreased year over year dropping from 87% to 79%. As a part of our initiatives around an enhanced student experience and our vision of preparing students for college, career and life, we are seeking to increase our acceleration rate via industry certification opportunities, AP and AICE coursework, and Dual Enrollment opportunities.

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.

Our accelerated rate will decrease from 87% to 79% of students who earned an industry certification or obtained college credit through AP/AICE testing or Dual Enrollment coursework. Our goal is to increase acceleration back up to 87% for the 12th grade cohort during the 2026-27 school year, and have 70% of our 9th grade students exit the 2026-27 school year with an accelerated credit through industry certifications and/or passing scores on AP/AICE exams.

Monitoring

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

Students will be coached and informed on the benefits of accelerated credits regularly throughout the year at various assemblies and meetings. Enrollment in qualifying coursework will be monitored by the Guidance Department. The SBLT will continue to look for opportunities that can be added to our

course catalog throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Eric Smith, Russell Denton, Guidance Dept.

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:

Increased industry certification dual enrollment coursework opportunities.

Rationale:

More options and opportunities mean more diverse options and pathways for students to explore acceleration in areas of interest and potentially earn credits beyond the minimum necessary for graduation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Intentional Scheduling

Person Monitoring:

Russell Denton

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

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

Schedules were intentionally created with 9th graders being required to select either Personal Finance (with an industry certification opportunity embedded) or AP US Government (with a college level acceleration end-of-course test opportunity). 11th and 12th graders who have still not obtained an accelerated point, but had openings on their schedule, were strategically placed in Dual Enrollment courses for which they were eligible which had open seats.

Action Step #2

Increased Accelerated Coursework Options

Person Monitoring:

Russell Denton and Eric Smith

By When/Frequency:

Bi-annually

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

Additional industry certification aligned courses, AICE courses, and Dual Enrollment courses were added (and will continue to be added) to the course catalog for students to have greater choice in obtaining accelerated credit.

Area of Focus #6

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.

2025–2026 data indicates that SWD exceeded district averages in ELA proficiency (42.2%), learning gains (49.0%), and Lowest 25% learning gains (56.6%). While overall mathematics achievement remained strong (70%), mathematics learning gains (61%) and learning gains for the Lowest 25% (57%) indicate that accelerating student growth remains a schoolwide priority. This need is particularly evident among SWD students. Despite positive outcomes, achievement gaps remain between SWD and non-SWD students, including a 39.9 percentage-point gap in ELA proficiency (42.2% vs. 82.1%) and a 34.3 percentage-point gap in mathematics proficiency (39.6% vs. 73.9%).

To improve ELA and math proficiency during the 2026–2027 school year, teachers will leverage evidence-based ESE instructional strategies, collaborative bi-weekly PLCs, common planning between math/ELA and ESE teachers, targeted small-group instruction, and timely interventions aligned to identified student needs. A continued focus on measuring mastery of benchmarks through common assessments, formative assessment practices, and ongoing progress monitoring will guide instructional decisions, while empowering students to take ownership of their learning through goal setting and monitoring their progress toward proficiency

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 Spring 2027,, SWD proficiency on the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC Assessments will increase to 60%, contributing to the school's overall mathematics proficiency goal of increasing from 70% to 75%.

Mathematics learning gains for SWD students will also increase to 60% from the prior-year and will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring, district common assessments, classroom formative assessments, PLC data reviews, and Algebra 1 and Geometry End-of-Course assessment results.

SWD proficiency in English Language Arts will increase from 50%, contributing to the school's overall ELA proficiency goal of increasing from 78% to 80%. and will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring, district common assessments, classroom formative assessments, PLC data reviews, and FAST ELA and BEST EOC assessment results.

Monitoring

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

This goal will be monitored ultimately by percentage of proficiency and math learning gains on the FAST ELA PM3 and through the BEST Algebra/Geometry EOCs. Administrative oversight with PLC processes and implementation will occur bi-weekly/monthly to ensure monitoring of student data is taking place and appropriate interventions are planned/implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jennifer Napier

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:

SWD strategies embedded into ELA/Math planning through PLC/common planning. Small group support with ESE faculty that is consistently monitored with classroom, district, and state assessments.

Rationale:

Student strategies and interventions are differentiated to meet the unique needs of each ESE student, addressing identified learning gaps and supporting progress toward proficiency.

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

ELA/Math and ESE Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Biweekly, Ongoing

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

Collaborative planning opportunities between ELA/Math and ESE teachers will be established at the beginning of the school year and occur weekly throughout the year. PLC meetings, occurring biweekly, will provide a consistent structure for teachers and administrators to collaborate, monitor student progress, reflect on instructional practices, and refine strategies to better meet the needs of SWD students and student learning gains overall.

Action Step #2

Intervention and Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Biweekly

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

Teachers will implement a continuum of instructional supports based on student need and evidence of student learning. Instruction will include differentiation, accommodations, and scaffolded learning experiences to support access to grade-level standards. Students identified through ongoing progress monitoring will receive flexible, teacher-led small-group instruction to explicitly reteach prerequisite skills and unmet standards identified through assessment data. Math and ESE teachers will collaboratively design and implement specialized instruction to reinforce prerequisite skills, support grade-level learning, and address individual student needs. Instructional groups and supports will be adjusted regularly based on evidence of student learning.

The impact of this action will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring, district common assessments, classroom formative assessments, student work, PLC data, and classroom walkthroughs. Math, ELA, and ESE teachers, along with school administrators, will regularly review student progress and instructional evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional supports, refine instructional practices, increase SWD proficiency, and reduce the achievement gap.

Action Step #3

Building Student Capacity through Metacognition

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Biweekly, Ongoing

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

Math, ELA, and ESE teachers will cultivate student ownership by regularly engaging students in discussions about their academic progress using assessment data, classroom performance, and progress-monitoring results. Teachers will support students in setting measurable academic goals, tracking standards mastery, reflecting on their progress, celebrating growth, and identifying next steps to increase ownership of learning and engagement. Through data chats, student conferencing, self-assessment, and reflection, students will learn to monitor their own progress and adjust learning strategies based on evidence of student learning.

Area of Focus #7

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to English Language Learners (ELL)**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.

ELL students' proficiency in ELA was at 39% compared to their non-ELL peers at 80%. This discrepancy is the largest gap between all core contents. Reducing the gap in ELA proficiency will be addressed through embedded ELL strategies to support ELA students, professional learning

experiences that are focused on ELL strategies that will improve teacher practice, integrated common planning/PLC between ELL and ELA staff, and small-group support with ELL faculty that is consistently monitored through PM results and classroom assessments.

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.

ELL student proficiency in ELA will increase comparable within 20% of their non-ELL peers. ELA combined (9th and 10th) goal is an 82. It is reasonable for our ELL population to range 60%-80% proficiency.

Monitoring

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

his goal will be monitored ultimately by percentage of proficiency on the FAST ELA PM3. Administrative oversight with PLC processes and implementation will occur bi-weekly/monthly to ensure monitoring of student data is taking place and appropriate interventions are planned for and implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Russell Denton

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:

ELL strategies embedded into ELA planning through PLC/common planning. Professional learning experiences that are focused on ELL strategies that will improve teacher practice. Small-group support with ELL faculty that is consistently monitored with PM results and classroom assessments

Rationale:

Each intervention has a targeted focus on the individual ELL student and is designed to fill the gap of misunderstanding, moving the student closer to proficient levels.

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

Monitoring and Data Driven instruction

Person Monitoring:

Russell Denton

By When/Frequency:

Throughout the school year

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

ELL strategies that ELA teachers are consistently using in their classrooms that were planned for through their collaboration with ELL faculty. Small group pull out when ELL students are in need of intervention and differentiated instruction.

Action Step #2

PLC/common planning integration of ELA and ELL faculty

Person Monitoring:

Russell Denton

By When/Frequency:

Summer planning, Throughout the year

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

Through the master schedule, ensuring ELA and ELL faculty have the opportunity plan together and regularly will be established at the beginning of the year. Administrative oversight on the fidelity of integrated ELA/ELL plans and strategy will occur during our PLC meeting schedule throughout the year.

Area of Focus #8

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.

2025–2026 data indicates that Black students demonstrated in Geometry proficiency rate of 59%, compared to 72% mathematics proficiency for non-Black students overall, identifying an opportunity to accelerate achievement and reduce the proficiency gap. To improve Geometry proficiency during the 2026–2027 school year, teachers will engage in collaborative bi-weekly PLCs and common planning to implement standards-based instructional practices and timely instructional responses aligned to identified student needs. Students requiring additional support will be monitored through the MTSS process to ensure instructional responses remain targeted and responsive to student progress. A continued focus on measuring mastery through common assessments, formative assessment practices, student work analysis, and ongoing progress monitoring will guide instructional decisions while empowering students to monitor their progress and take ownership of their learning.

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.

Increase Geometry proficiency for Black students from 59% to 65% by Spring 2027, as measured by the Florida B.E.S.T. Geometry EOC Assessment, reducing the proficiency gap, and supporting the school's overall Geometry proficiency goal of 77%.

Monitoring

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

Implementation and impact will be monitored through collaborative bi-weekly PLCs, common planning, classroom walkthroughs, FAST Progress Monitoring, district common assessments, classroom formative assessments, student work analysis, and MTSS data reviews. Math teachers and school administrators will regularly analyze student progress and instructional evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices and supports, refine instructional decisions, and monitor progress toward increasing Geometry proficiency for Black students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jennifer Napier

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:

Teachers will use common assessments, classroom formative assessments, student work analysis, and ongoing progress monitoring to measure mastery of grade-level standards. Assessment data will be used to identify learning needs, monitor student growth, and inform timely instructional responses.

Rationale:

Frequent progress monitoring and formative assessment provide teachers with immediate evidence of student learning, allowing instruction to be adjusted before misconceptions become learning gaps. Ongoing monitoring supports timely intervention and improved student outcomes.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Students demonstrating a need for additional support will be discussed through the school's MTSS process to review academic progress, identify barriers to learning, monitor the effectiveness of instructional supports, and adjust interventions based on ongoing progress-monitoring data. MTSS meetings will facilitate collaboration among teachers, school counselors, administrators, and other instructional support staff to ensure timely, coordinated support.

Rationale:

A Multi-Tiered System of Supports provides a structured, data-driven framework for identifying students requiring additional support, monitoring intervention effectiveness, and ensuring instructional decisions are responsive to individual student needs. Regular MTSS review promotes early intervention, collaborative problem-solving, and continuous monitoring of student progress.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Collaborative PLCs and Common Planning

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Biweekly/Ongoing

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

Teachers will collaboratively analyze student assessment data through bi-weekly PLCs and common planning to identify trends, misconceptions, and instructional priorities. Using this evidence, they will develop and implement standards-based instructional responses aligned to student needs. Implementation will be monitored through PLC documentation, collaborative planning, classroom walkthroughs, and evidence of student learning.

Action Step #2

MTSS Supports and Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Weekly/Ongoing

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

Teachers will identify students requiring additional support through ongoing progress monitoring. Administration, school counselors, and student services will meet weekly through the MTSS process to review student progress, identify barriers to learning, monitor student response to interventions, and determine next steps based on student needs.

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.

East Lake High School's PBIS area of focus is strengthening schoolwide positive recognition and reinforcement for students in grades 9–12. Although students are actively involved in the school community, the school has identified an opportunity to create a more consistent, visible, and engaging system for recognizing students who demonstrate schoolwide expectations, make positive choices, and contribute to the campus community.

Positive recognition supports student learning by reinforcing behaviors that promote a productive learning environment, including responsibility, respect, engagement, attendance, and academic effort. When expectations and recognition practices are consistent across classrooms and common areas, students have a clearer understanding of expected behaviors and are more likely to remain engaged in learning.

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.

During the 2025–2026 school year, East Lake High School maintained an established PBIS program through student recognition and incentives. Prior-year data showed that 20% of students received documented PBIS recognition.

By May 2027, the school will increase the percentage of students in each grade level who receive at least one documented PBIS recognition per quarter by 10 percentage points from the 2025–2026 baseline. Recognition data will be reviewed quarterly by grade level to monitor consistency, equitable participation, and student access to meaningful incentives through the strengthened PBIS program and revitalized school store.

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's marketing and student experience committee will monitor implementation and progress monthly by reviewing the number and percentage of students receiving positive recognition, the frequency and distribution of recognitions across grades 9–12, staff participation, and student use of PBIS incentives and the school store. Student feedback will be collected to evaluate whether the incentives are meaningful and contribute positively to the student experience.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jennifer Napier

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:

East Lake High School will strengthen its existing Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) framework for students in grades 9–12. The intervention will include consistent staff use of behavior-specific positive recognition, clear communication and reinforcement of schoolwide expectations, and meaningful incentives through a revitalized school store. Student feedback will help guide the selection of incentives to ensure they are relevant and motivating for high school students.

Rationale:

Schoolwide PBIS is an evidence-based framework designed to improve school climate, student behavior, engagement, and access to learning through clearly defined expectations and consistent positive reinforcement. This intervention was selected because a review of prior-year PBIS practices identified an opportunity to improve the consistency, visibility, and appeal of the school's existing recognition system. Strengthening these practices will help ensure that students across all grade levels and subgroups have equitable opportunities to be recognized for positive behavior, engagement, and contributions to the school community.

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

Establish a Consistent Schoolwide Recognition System

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Marketing/Student Experience Committee will review and strengthen the existing campuswide process for recognizing students who demonstrate schoolwide expectations, positive behavior, engagement, and contributions to the school community.

Action Step #2

Strengthen Staff Implementation of PBIS Recognition

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Staff will receive clear guidance and ongoing communication regarding schoolwide expectations, behavior-specific positive recognition, and procedures for providing PBIS incentives. The PBIS team will promote consistent implementation across classrooms and common areas. Staff participation and recognition data will be reviewed quarterly to identify implementation trends, celebrate progress, and provide additional communication or support where needed.

Action Step #3

Revitalize the PBIS School Store and Student Incentives

Person Monitoring:

Jennifer Napier

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

The school will expand and update PBIS incentives through a revitalized school store that offers relevant and appealing merchandise, experiences, and recognition opportunities for students in grades 9–12. Student feedback will be collected to guide incentive selection. The Marketing/Student Experience team will monitor store use, incentive redemptions, student feedback, and participation to determine which incentives are most effective and make adjustments throughout the year

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.

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