

Seminole County Public Schools

LAKE MARY 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..... 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 24

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 26

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 29

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 30

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Lake Mary Elementary is to promote self-esteem, strong academic achievement, creativity and acceptance of responsibility through building relationships and establishing high academic expectations in a safe, positive environment that unifies staff, parents and community to prepare all students for success in real-life experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Lake Mary Elementary is to ensure every students will have one year's academic growth in one year's time. Lake Mary Elementary will continue to increase overall academic achievement for all students in preparation for college and career readiness.

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

Charlotte Little

charlotte_little@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee school operations and safety; ensure the academic success of all students

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Lynette Bornemann

lynette_bornemann@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist the principal with school operations and safety; ensure the academic success of all students

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Angela Shapiro

angela_shapiro@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist the principal and assistant principal with school operations and safety; ensure the academic success of all students

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Rebecca Pitzen

pitzenrz@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Instructional support for teachers; MTSS lead facilitator; ensure the academic success of all students

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.

Lake Mary Elementary actively engages parents and our community through various collaborative methods. This involvement includes holding school advisory council meetings where parents and community members share their input and ideas. To ensure our the plan is communicated effectively to all stakeholders, including parents, it will be presented in clear and simple language, avoiding jargon.

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)).

Regular updates will be shared with parents and our community through newsletters, school websites, social media, and in-person meetings. This transparent communication allows parents to stay informed about the ongoing initiatives and provides opportunities for feedback and suggestions. Student achievement data after each FAST assessment cycle is shared with stakeholders.

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	51.3%
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) 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>	2024-25: B 2023-24: B 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	101	97	164	121	133	134				750
Absent 10% or more school days	3	9	14	14	15	15				70
One or more suspensions	0	1	8	3	3	4				19
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	19	28	11	13	1				72
Course failure in Math	0	18	19	6	8	7				58
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	4	41	22	11	19				97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	30	22	11	19				86
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	7	11	8	11	0				37
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	3	16	6	0	3				28

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	17	39	22	16	20	0	0	0	114

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	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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		38	18	22	13	24				115
One or more suspensions		1	1	1	1					4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		7	4		2					13
Course failure in Math		4	1	1	1					7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				18	20	19				57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				21	23	22				66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		9	1	5						15
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		4	2	4	1					11

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		12	7	6	4	6				35

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	3	6		6						15
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*	68	68	59	63	66	57	61	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	72	71	59	64	69	58	57	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	62	63	60	60	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60	56	56	57	55	57			
Math Achievement*	68	69	64	64	67	62	59	64	59
Math Learning Gains	54	65	63	59	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40	47	51	45	43	52			
Science Achievement	65	68	58	69	68	57	62	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	68	73	63	75	75	61	42	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	62%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	557
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
62%	62%	60%	61%	56%		69%

* 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	41%	No		
English Language Learners	52%	No		
Asian Students	54%	No		
Black/African American Students	55%	No		
Hispanic Students	62%	No		
Multiracial Students	49%	No		
White Students	67%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	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	68%	72%	62%	60%	68%	54%	40%	65%					68%
Students With Disabilities	33%	26%	59%	64%	35%	47%	40%	24%					
English Language Learners	44%		53%	47%	54%	53%	44%	50%					68%
Asian Students	50%				57%								
Black/African American Students	64%		60%		66%	33%		54%					
Hispanic Students	66%	72%	65%	62%	64%	53%	50%	67%					61%
Multiracial Students	65%		36%		55%	32%		57%					
White Students	74%	74%	67%	77%	75%	60%	35%	71%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	65%	58%	59%	57%	51%	35%	52%					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	63%	64%	60%	57%	64%	59%	45%	69%					75%
Students With Disabilities	28%	26%	46%	48%	37%	46%	44%	31%					
English Language Learners	48%	53%	56%	47%	53%	63%	55%						75%
Asian Students	47%		69%		59%	54%							
Black/African American Students	56%	58%	67%		53%	52%	50%	50%					
Hispanic Students	56%	45%	53%	43%	57%	60%	46%	64%					81%
Multiracial Students	56%		58%		56%	63%							
White Students	71%	75%	63%	68%	71%	58%	48%	76%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%	51%	50%	45%	54%	57%	41%	58%					71%

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	61%	57%			59%			62%					42%
Students With Disabilities	34%	31%			33%			20%					
English Language Learners	35%	33%			35%			45%					60%
Asian Students	47%				47%								
Black/African American Students	38%	40%			35%			33%					
Hispanic Students	56%	62%			48%			39%					50%
Multiracial Students	58%	50%			50%								
White Students	70%	64%			69%			76%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49%	46%			45%			46%					55%

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.

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	71%	69%	2%	57%	14%
ELA	4	72%	67%	5%	56%	16%
ELA	5	61%	64%	-3%	56%	5%
Math	3	75%	70%	5%	63%	12%
Math	4	73%	69%	4%	62%	11%
Math	5	38%	46%	-8%	57%	-19%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	65%	66%	-1%	55%	10%

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?

Our area of greatest improvement was achieved in our learning gains for our ELA lowest quartile students with disabilities. This component improved from 48% in 2023-2024 to 64% in 2024-2025. This is an increase of 16% points. Actions taken in this greatest area of improvement included ensuring ESE Support Facilitators worked with small groups of students on an upcoming, present, or trailing benchmark during their Support Facilitation time. ESE teachers presented information using evidenced-based ESE strategies to help students process information. Administration monitored instruction by conducting walkthroughs and monitored students' summative grade level data. Teachers received actionable feedback to rectify any issues.

Lowest Performance

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

Our lowest performance data component was our science achievement for our students with disabilities. This area decreased from 31% proficiency to 24% proficiency. A contributing factor to this low performance was the lack of science text being used during ELA support facilitation.

Greatest Decline

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

Our data component showing the greatest decline from the 2023-2024 school year was our math learning gains for our multi-racial students. This area declined from a proficiency rate of 63% to 32%. The contributing factors to this decline were a lack of student accountability during independent small group station work and a lack of administrative monitoring of math intervention groups.

Greatest Gap

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average is 5th grade math. The state's proficiency for 5th grade math is 57%. Our school's proficiency is 37%. The contributing factor

for this gap is our accelerated math program called RAMP. This program accelerates 5th grade students by taking 6th grade math and therefore the 6th grade math FAST. Our school had 29% of our 5th grade students enrolled in this accelerated math program.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Our areas of concern are 52 students scoring at Level 1 for ELA and 52 students scoring at a Level 1 for Math.

Highest Priorities

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

- Increase ELA Achievement from 68% to 75%.
- Increase Math Achievement from 68% to 75%
- Increase Science Achievement from 65% to 75%
- Ensure learning gains for all students reach a percentage of 70% for ELA and Math (This includes overall learning gains and lowest quartile.)
- Improve student attendance by decreasing the percent of students absent by 10%

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.

Our area of focus is to improve instructional practice in the areas of ELA. Through improving instructional practice, our student achievement in the area of ELA will improve and we will close achievement gaps between subgroups.

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.

Through strengthening our instructional practice, we will increase achievement in ELA from 68% to 75%. Strengthening our instructional practice will also ensure our ELA learning gains overall and in our lowest quartile will improve to 70%.

Monitoring

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

To ensure instructional practice is strengthening, our instructional coach and administration will conduct frequent walkthroughs using the SCPS Instructional Priorities application tool which will provide us with school-wide instructional practice trends which will help us to provide actionable feedback to grade levels during Professional Learning Communities and specific feedback to teachers as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Rebecca Pitzen, Lynette Bornemann, Charlotte Little

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 (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence) FastForward (promising evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence).

Rationale:

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum. All of the listed interventions have been included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

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

Strengthen ELA Instructional Practice

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann, Rebecca Pitzen

By When/Frequency:

Daily

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

To strengthen our instructional practice and meet our student achievement outcomes, our instructional coach and administration will attend weekly PLCs to ensure grade levels are reviewing student evidence of learning and making instructional adjustments. Grade level PLCs will be monitored to ensure teams are discussing Achievement Level Descriptors for each benchmark and answering the four pivotal PLC questions: What do we want all students to know and be able to do? How will we know if they learn it? How will we respond when some students do not learn? How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient? Grade levels 3rd through 5th will use Standards Mastery with students in two phases: Phase 1: From August through December in a whole group setting with the teacher modeling metacognition and student collaboration. Phase 2: From January through May in small teacher-led groups based on students' needs. Our instructional Coach and administration will conduct walkthroughs during the implementation of each phase of Standards Mastery to provide actionable feedback to teachers as needed. Grades K-5 will strengthen ELA student centers/stations through developing station mats using summative assessment data. Each station mat will meet the grade level benchmark and include student accountability through task evidence.

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.

Our area of focus is to improve instructional practice in the area of Math. Through improving instructional practice, our student achievement in the area of Math will improve and we will close achievement gaps between subgroups.

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.

Through strengthening our instructional practice, we will increase achievement in Math from 68% to 75%. Strengthening our instructional practice will also ensure our Math learning gains overall and in our lowest quartile will improve to 70%.

Monitoring

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

To ensure instructional practice is strengthening, our administration will conduct frequent walkthroughs using the SCPS Instructional Priorities application tool which will provide us with school-wide instructional practice trends which will help us to provide actionable feedback to grade levels during Professional Learning Communities and specific feedback to teachers as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann

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: Ready Florida BEST Math Instruction, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

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

Strengthen Math Instructional Practice

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann

By When/Frequency:

Daily

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

To strengthen our instructional practice and meet our student achievement outcomes, administration will attend weekly PLCs to ensure grade levels are reviewing student evidence of learning and making instructional adjustments. Grade level PLCs will be monitored to ensure teams are discussing Achievement Level Descriptors for each benchmark and answering the four pivotal PLC questions: What do we want all students to know and be able to do? How will we know if they learn it? How will we respond when some students do not learn? How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient? Grade levels 3rd through 5th will use Standards Mastery with students in two phases: Phase 1: From August through December in a whole group setting with the teacher modeling metacognition and student collaboration. Phase 2: From January through May in small teacher-led groups based on students' needs. Administration will conduct walkthroughs during the implementation of each phase of Standards Mastery to provide actionable feedback to teachers as needed. Grades K-5 will strengthen Math student centers/stations through developing station mats using summative assessment data. Each station mat will meet the grade level benchmark and include student accountability through task evidence.

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.

Our area of focus is to improve instructional practice in the area of Science. Through improving instructional practice, our student achievement in the area of Science will improve and we will close achievement gaps between subgroups.

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.

Through strengthening our instructional practice, we will increase achievement in Science from 65% to 75%.

Monitoring

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

To ensure instructional practice is strengthening, our administration will conduct frequent walkthroughs using the SCPS Instructional Priorities application tool which will provide us with school-wide instructional practice trends which will help us to provide actionable feedback to grade levels during Professional Learning Communities and specific feedback to teachers as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann

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:**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

Strengthen Science Instructional Practice

Person Monitoring:

Charlotte Little, Lynette Bornemann

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

To strengthen our instructional practice and meet our student achievement outcomes, administration will attend bi-weekly PLCs to ensure grade levels are reviewing student evidence of learning and making instructional adjustments. Grade level PLCs will be monitored to ensure teams are discussing

and answering the four pivotal PLC questions: What do we want all students to know and be able to do? How will we know if they learn it? How will we respond when some students do not learn? How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient? Grades K-5 will strengthen Science student centers/stations through developing station mats using summative assessment data. Each station mat will meet the grade level benchmark and include student accountability through task evidence. Based on district benchmark data, Our Instructional Coach and Administration will conduct science intervention groups in the spring.

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.

Student attendance can negatively affect their academic performance due to missing core instruction. During the 2024-2025 school year, our school had 19% of our student miss 10+ days.

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.

Based on 24-25 attendance data of 19% of students missing 10+ days, we will decrease absenteeism by 10%.

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.

Attendance reports will be reviewed weekly through our attendance incentive program. Our attendance incentive program rewards classrooms with perfect attendance on the morning news.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Lynette Bornemann

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:**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

Attendance Incentive

Person Monitoring:

Lynette Bornemann

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Weekly attendance reports will be monitored for all students and classes with perfect attendance will be given certificates. Classes receiving certificates will be announced on the morning news. Our goal is to increase daily attendance based on creating a positive culture in the classroom and promoting team work.

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