

Seminole County Public Schools

GENEVA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 6
 - D. Early Warning Systems 7
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 17
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 18
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 26
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 29
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 32
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 33

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on Board Approved 10/07/2025.

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

Geneva Elementary, in partnership with our families and community, provides a safe, supportive, and intentional learning environment where students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens and lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement

At Geneva Elementary, we will have a safe, supportive, and intentional learning environment with high expectations of students to engage in rigorous tasks and applications. Teachers participating in professional learning communities will produce standards-based student tasks. Student learning outcomes will demonstrate knowledge application through forms of verbal and written communications. Students can be seen interacting purposefully and showing evidence of learning. Students will be engaged in the problem solving, collaborating, using evidence or artifacts to defend their thinking – knowledge built through complex texts and rigorous mathematical applications. The goal of this vision is to provide all students with one year's growth, in one year's time.

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

Keith Erickson

keith_erickson@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Principal provides the school-based leadership required to sustain a focus on improving instruction to increase the achievement of all students in a safe learning environment while ensuring the orderly and efficient operation of the school. The principal role includes:: SIP, Low Quartile, MTSS, SST, Teacher Feedback, PBIS, Emergency Response, Teacher/Staff Evaluations, PDs, PLCs, PTA, Budget, SAC, Communications for stakeholders.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Jeff Fose

jeff_fose@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Assistant Principal provides the school-based leadership required to sustain a focus on improving instruction to increase the achievement of all students in a safe learning environment while ensuring the orderly and efficient operation of the school. The assistant principal role includes:: SIP, Low Quartile, MTSS, SST, Teacher Feedback, PBIS, Emergency Response, Teacher/Staff Evaluations, PDs, PLCs, Testing, and Communications for stakeholders.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Alison Burke

alison_burke@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Certified School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist school personnel, parents, and students with relevant educational and personal/social goals and planning. Develop and provide an effective comprehensive guidance and counseling program to serve the needs of all students.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Lisa Davidson

lisa_davidson@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Collaborate with the school leadership team to plan and implement a consistent program of improving reading achievement using evidence based reading strategies and interventions designed in the science of reading. Collect and use data on instructional practices to inform and implement professional learning activities for staff.

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

Olivia Vonhagel

olivia_bough-vonhagel@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Technology Facilitator / STEM Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Collaborate with school leadership team on global citizenship and future ready goals for student success. Coach and support teachers while coordinating and organizing instructional technology and applications. Monitor math achievement data in collaboration with school administration.

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.

Geneva employs parent and community involvement through various survey collections and local School Advisory Meetings. Stakeholders provide input to establish common goals and ideas aligned to our Seminole County mission and school wide vision. Input is utilized to collaborate and develop plans such as family events to impact the welfare and success of the school.

Our PTA supports our schools goals and improvement efforts by providing human and financial resources. Input and feedback from our SAC is used in developing this plan as well as giving the final approval of the School Improvement Plan.

3. SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the state academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The School Improvement Plan will be presented to the faculty and staff at the beginning of the school year. The goal will be to review the SIP after each FAST assessment and make necessary revisions to ensure continuous improvement.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	43.3%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) 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>	2024-25: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: B 2021-22: B 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	48	87	62	76	68	98				439
Absent 10% or more school days	2	7	7	6	6	8				36
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	0	5	3				14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	12	10	5	2	3				32
Course failure in Math	0	12	8	6	1	2				29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	21	12	10	4	19				66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	16	13	12	3	24				68
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	4	5	8	10	0				27
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	3	6	5	0	4				18

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	13	14	15	7	18				67

Current Year 2025-26

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	6	1	0	0	0				7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1				1

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	1	19	13	23	23	28				107
One or more suspensions				2	1	1				4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	3	3	1						8
Course failure in Math	1	3	3	1						8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				4	1	14				19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				2	9	14				25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	1	5	2	9						17
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	1	4	2	2						9

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators		6	4	7	3	13				33

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	1	5	1	2						9
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

The district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	71	68	59	64	66	57	57	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	79	71	59	67	69	58	59	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	64	63	60	63	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57	56	56	58	55	57			
Math Achievement*	71	69	64	67	67	62	58	64	59
Math Learning Gains	66	65	63	65	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44	47	51	34	43	52			
Science Achievement	79	68	58	77	68	57	69	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	73	63		75	61		77		59

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPi) than in school grades calculation.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	66%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	531
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
66%	62%	61%	60%	56%		58%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	43%	No		
Hispanic Students	76%	No		
Multiracial Students	75%	No		
White Students	63%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	No		

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	71%	79%	64%	57%	71%	66%	44%	79%					
Students With Disabilities	38%	43%	45%	35%	40%	46%	29%	67%					
Hispanic Students	76%	82%	69%		80%	73%		76%					
Multiracial Students	80%				70%								
White Students	70%	77%	60%	47%	69%	63%	39%	82%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	58%	61%	64%	59%	62%	61%	44%	65%					

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	64%	67%	63%	58%	67%	65%	34%	77%					
Students With Disabilities	31%	35%	58%	61%	35%	52%	35%	47%					
Hispanic Students	68%		50%		77%	55%							
White Students	63%	64%	65%	62%	65%	69%	36%	75%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	54%	56%	59%	50%	48%	19%	64%					

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2021-22	C&C ACCEL 2021-22	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	57%	59%			58%			69%					
Students With Disabilities	29%	47%			24%			14%					
Hispanic Students	68%	67%			71%			73%					
White Students	55%	57%			56%			71%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	38%	45%			41%			53%					

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.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2024-25 SPRING				
		SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	77%	69%	8%	57%	20%
ELA	4	68%	67%	1%	56%	12%
ELA	5	69%	64%	5%	56%	13%
Math	3	85%	70%	15%	63%	22%
Math	4	59%	69%	-10%	62%	-3%
Math	5	60%	46%	14%	57%	3%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	77%	66%	11%	55%	22%

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?

For the 2024-25 school year, Geneva Elementary made the most improvement in third grade ELA proficiency. In 2024, 67% of third grade students demonstrated proficiency. In 2025, 79% of third grade students at Geneva Elementary demonstrated proficiency in ELA. This is an increase of 12% year over year.

New Actions: Coaching from Dr. Wenzel on the science of reading and small group instruction implementation. Coach led data analysis with teachers to ensure student mastery of BEST Benchmarks.

Lowest Performance

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

Despite a 10% increase from 2024, mathematics learning gains of the lowest 25% remained the lowest performing category at Geneva Elementary school, with just 44% of these students demonstrated a learning gain.

Contributing Factors: Inexperience with implementation of new teaching practices. Behavioral challenges in testing grade levels.

Greatest Decline

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

Year over year, English language arts learning gains of the lowest 25% decreased by 1% from 58% in 2024 to 57% in 2025.

New Actions: Coaching from Dr. Wenzel on the science of reading and small group instruction implementation. Coach led data analysis with teachers to ensure student mastery of BEST Benchmarks.

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.

Mathematics learning gains of the lowest quartile demonstrated a 7% gap between Geneva Elementary and the state. The state average for this category is 51% and Geneva Elementary students scored 44% in this category.

Contributing Factors: Inexperience with implementation of new teaching practices. Behavioral challenges in testing grade levels.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

1. 41 students, or 9%, were absent 10% or more days during the 2024-25 school year.
2. 33 students in grades 3, 4 and 5, or 13% of students, scored a level 1 on the statewide math assessment.

Highest Priorities

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

Monitor professional learning community meetings for both ELA and math to ensure teachers are planning instruction to move students towards mastery of the BEST standards.

Strengthen small group instruction in math to ensure differentiation to increase student learning gains, particularly with ESE and lowest quartile students.

Implement attendance incentives to continue to decrease the number of students with 10% or more days absent.

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 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.

44% of students in the Lowest Quartile made a learning gain on the FAST PM3 Mathematics Assessment. Overall, Geneva increased Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile from 34% in 2024 to 44% in 2025, but this is an area that needs continuing improvement.

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.

Students in the Math Lowest Quartile will grow from 44% of students to 62% of students making a learning gain on the 2026 FAST Mathematics PM3.

Monitoring

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

Administrators and coaches will use the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor the effectiveness of classroom instruction.

All student data will be monitored through grade level data sheets. These sheets include progress monitoring assessments and will serve as the primary talking points during PLCs that focus on data.

The school leadership team will maintain a separate data monitoring sheet focused solely on tracking the growth of each student in the math lowest quartile. These data sheets will serve as the primary talking points during weekly Leadership Team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Olivia Vonhagel

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 following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, and FactTactics.

Rationale:

All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Instructional Priorities for Math

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Lisa Davidson, Olivia Vonhagel

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

1. Professional development will be provided to teachers on benchmark aligned instruction, monitoring for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning as they relate to instruction in the math block. 2. Administrators and Instructional Coaches will reinforce math block expectations. Expectations are as follows: 30 minutes of whole group instruction, remaining math block consists of small group instruction and center rotations, teachers will meet with tier 3 and lowest quartile math students daily, learning targets are benchmark-aligned and posted at each center for students to utilize. 3. Teachers will monitor students learning through all phases of the math block including whole group instruction, small group differentiated instruction, and independent center work. Teachers will provide timely and specific feedback to improve student understanding. 4. Throughout the math block, the teacher will utilize collaborative structures. Academic vocabulary will be posted in the classroom and students will be monitored for their use of academic vocabulary in their discussions with each other. Instructional Coaches and administrators will monitor the implementation of the instructional priorities with classroom walkthroughs focused on these four priorities. Student data will be monitored as outlined in action step 2.

Action Step #2

Monitoring Progress in Math

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Lisa Davidson, Olivia Vonhagel

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

1. With the support of instructional coaches, teachers will enter student achievement data into grade level data sheets. Data being tracked will be FAST Mathematics Progress Monitors, iReady Math Diagnostic, and benchmark aligned mid-unit and unit assessments. This data will be the primary talking points for PLCs. 2. PLC data-driven discussion will inform the direction of instruction in each individual classroom. Administrators will participate in PLCs and then monitor classroom instruction based on PLC discussion. 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs using iObservation, the SCPS Instructional Priorities Checklist, and the Geneva Math Expectations Checklist to monitor the implementation of the instructional priorities. Individual coaching and differentiated professional development will be provided to teachers as needed based on classroom walkthrough data.

Area of Focus #2

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.

57% of students in the lowest quartile demonstrated a learning gain on state reading assessment in 2025. This is a drop of 1% from 2024.

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.

Students in the Reading Lowest Quartile will grow from 57% of students to 62% of student making a learning gain on the 2026 FAST Reading PM3.

Monitoring

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

Administrators and coaches will use the SCPS Instructional Priorities walkthrough tool to monitor the effectiveness of classroom instruction.

All student data will be monitored through grade level data sheets. These sheets include progress monitoring assessments and will serve as the primary talking points during PLCs that focus on data.

The school leadership team will maintain a separate data monitoring sheet focused solely on tracking the growth of each student in the ELA lowest quartile. These data sheets will serve as the primary talking points during weekly Leadership Team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Lisa Davidson

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 following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading, Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady, and UFLI.

Rationale:

All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Instructional Priorities for ELA

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Lisa Davidson

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

1. Professional development will be provided to teachers on benchmark aligned instruction, monitoring for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning as they relate to instruction in the ELA block. 2. Administrators and Instructional Coaches will reinforce ELA block expectations. Expectations are as follows: 30 minutes of whole group instruction, remaining ELA block will consist of small group instruction and center rotations, teachers will meet with tier 3 and lowest quartile ELA students daily, learning targets are benchmark-aligned and posted at each center for students to utilize. 3. Teachers will monitor students learning through all phases of the ELA block including UFLI instruction in primary grade levels, whole group instruction, small group differentiated instruction, and independent center work. Teachers will provide timely and specific feedback to improve student understanding. 4. Throughout the ELA block, the teacher will utilize collaborative structures. Academic vocabulary will be posted in the classroom and students will be monitored for their use of academic vocabulary in their discussions with each other. Instructional Coaches and administrators will monitor the implementation of the instructional priorities with classroom walkthroughs focused on these four priorities. Student data will be monitored as outlined in action step 2.

Action Step #2

Monitoring Progress in ELA

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Lisa Davidson

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

1. With the support of instructional coaches, teachers will enter student achievement data into grade level data sheets. Data being tracked will be Flamingo Phonemic Awareness Screeners, Core Phonics Screeners, FAST Reading Progress Monitors, iReady Reading Diagnostic, and benchmark aligned mid-unit and unit assessments. This data will be the primary talking points for PLCs. 2. PLC data-driven discussion will inform the direction of instruction in each individual classroom. Administrators will participate in PLCs and then monitor classroom instruction based on PLC discussion. 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs using iObservation, the SCPS Instructional Priorities Checklist, and the Geneva ELA Expectations Checklist to monitor the implementation of the instructional priorities. Individual coaching and differentiated professional development will be provided to teachers as needed based on classroom walkthrough data.

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.

In 2025, 79% of students demonstrated proficiency on the Florida Statewide Science Assessment. This was an increase of 2% from 2024.

Measurable Outcome

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

Proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessment will increase from 79% to 84% by May, 2026.

Monitoring

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

Administrators and coaches will use the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor the effectiveness of classroom instruction.

All student data will be monitored through grade level data sheets. These sheets include the SCPS Science Standards Based Assessments and will serve as the primary talking points during PLCs that focus on data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Olivia Vonhagel, Lisa Davidson

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:

McGraw Hill Science

Rationale:

The above listed intervention have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Instructional Priorities for Science

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Olivia Vonhagel, Lisa Davison

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

1. Professional development will be provided to teachers on benchmark aligned instruction, monitoring for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning as they relate to instruction in the Science block. 2. Administrators and Instructional Coaches will reinforce Science Block expectations. Expectations are as follows: 30 minutes of whole group instruction at least four days per week, one day of hands-on experiments per week, whole group science instruction should include explicit instruction on academic vocabulary in grades K-5 and at least one Context Dependent Set per unit in grades 3-5. 3. Teachers will monitor students learning through all phases of the science unit, and will provide timely and specific feedback to improve student understanding. Teachers will differentiate science instruction based on evidence collected during monitoring. 4. Throughout the science block, the teacher will utilize collaborative structures. Academic vocabulary will be posted in the classroom and students will be monitored for their use of academic vocabulary in their discussions with each other. Instructional Coaches and administrators will monitor the implementation of the instructional priorities with classroom walkthroughs focused on these four priorities. Student data will be monitored as outlined in action step 2.

Action Step #2

Monitoring Progress in Science

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Olivia Vonhagel, Lisa

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Davidson

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

1. With the support of instructional coaches, teachers will enter student achievement data into grade level data sheets. Data being tracked will be SCPS Standards Based Assessments, and benchmark aligned mid-unit and unit assessments. This data will be the primary talking points for science PLCs.
 2. PLC data-driven discussion will inform the direction of instruction in each individual classroom. Administrators will participate in PLCs and then monitor classroom instruction based on PLC discussion.
 3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs using iObservation and the SCPS Instructional Priorities Checklist to monitor the implementation of the instructional priorities. Individual coaching and differentiated professional development will be provided to teachers as needed based on classroom walkthrough data.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

In the 2024-25 school year, 41 students were absent for 10% or more days of school. This equates to 9% of students with 18 or more absences.

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.

In the 2025-26 school year, Geneva will reduce the percent of students with 10% or more absences to 5%.

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.

Student attendance will be monitored weekly. As students surpass thresholds of 5, 10, and 15 absences, SCPS truancy procedures will be followed, and these students will be sorted into subgroups to be monitored weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Alison Burke

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 Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior. Schools should have evidence of a strong Tier 1 framework of support in all of these areas.

Rationale:

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance. Interventions should be targeted to meet a specific need of students at the school based on data and should involve explicit teaching and monitoring.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Presentation of Truancy Procedures

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Alison Burke

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

An MTSS PLC will be utilized to review attendance and truancy procedures, in addition to reviewing best practices for increasing engagement and attendance for students.

Action Step #2

Truancy/Attendance Communication

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Alison Burke, Glenda Agosto

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

1. Information will be sent out regularly to parents about the importance of attendance. Including a guide in the welcome packet. 2. Teachers will use a tiered communication system to identify absences with families. 3. Our Social Worker will monitor attendance and send out letters. 4. Our Social Worker will review the truancy procedures with the staff.

Action Step #3

Positive Reinforcement

Person Monitoring:

Keith Erickson, Jeff Fose, Alison Burke

By When/Frequency:

Monthly, Quarterly

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

1. Students with perfect attendance will be recognized by the principal on the school morning news each month. Students with monthly perfect attendance will receive a certificate and "Spirit Bucks" to celebrate their accomplishment. 2. Students with perfect attendance at the end of each quarter will be recognized by the principal on the school morning news after the quarter concludes. Students with quarterly perfect attendance will receive a certificate, spirit bucks, and attend "Popsicles with the Principal" to celebrate their accomplishment.

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 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 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

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