

Seminole County Public Schools

EVANS 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 25

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

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 Seminole County Public Schools and Evans Elementary is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement

Evans Elementary's vision is that all students will acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens that can effectively collaborate with others to identify and solve problems. Every Evans Elementary student will make a minimum of 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

Pam Gamble

pam_gamble@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Sets the vision, implements the School Improvement Plan through school-based professional learning and monitors progress, knows the school goals and selects strategies to achieve them, understands school data and uses data to set school goals and monitors goals being met. Cultivates a mindset of focus for the leadership team – prioritizes what is most important and aligns actions accordingly. Provides leadership for setting school targets and presents evidence to district of the plan for school improvement each year. Makes sure goals set in the School Improvement Plan are strategically

aligned with district priorities. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Sharon Klein

kleinsl@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists with implementation of the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about curriculum, assessment, instruction, and professional learning to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Assists in activating the school improvement plan through school-based professional learning and monitors progress, knows the school goals and selects strategies to achieve them, understands school data and uses data to set school goals, helps monitor progress of goals.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Carol Lynn Everett

carollynn_everett@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about professional learning in order to improve student behavior and learning outcomes, helps create a safe and nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals, helps keep the focus on the targets and works to assure that the structures in place support the instructional program, helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Raquel Rona

raquel_rona@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Math Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about Math curriculum, Math assessment, Math instruction, and Math professional learning in order to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals. Helps set school math goals, and through effective and purposeful PLC meetings, assists teachers with designing strategies and monitoring progress in math. Helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

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

Ilaria Sessa

ilaria_bonomo@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about ELA curriculum, ELA assessment, ELA instruction, and ELA professional learning to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals. Helps set school reading goals, and through effective and purposeful PLC meetings, assists teachers with designing strategies and monitoring progress in reading. Helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

Leadership Team Member #6**Employee's Name**

Lauren Patterson

patterle@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Certified School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions using data on how to close academic and social-emotional gaps by connecting students with the services they need in order to improve student learning outcomes, and helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals with respect to social and emotional needs of students and the training needed by staff. Helps set school goals, design strategies and monitor progress in social-emotional learning. Helps monitor progress of the goals in

the School Improvement Plan.

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.

The School Advisory Committee, which includes parents, teachers, non-instructional personnel, and community members participated in the development of the School Improvement Plan. During a SAC meeting, ideas for student improvement were discussed by the committee and added to the plan. The plan includes strategies that will improve student achievement. Prior to the SAC reviewing plan, it was shared with the school leadership team, teachers and staff for feedback.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored by the leadership team and the faculty and staff following each progress monitoring testing window. Implementation checks will take place at SAC meetings following each progress monitoring testing window. Revisions will be made as needed.

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	39.2%
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: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: A 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	103	109	108	121	130	126				697
Absent 10% or more school days	8	13	10	8	9	6				54
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	3	0	4				14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	10	26	10	3	2				55
Course failure in Math	4	9	20	6	3	8				50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	21	20	10	14				65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	1	14	15	9	17				56
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	3	13	5	16	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	5	4	8	0	6				23

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	4	9	29	18	11	11	0	0	0	82

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	5	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	2	15	27	12	17	22				95
One or more suspensions		1	2	2	3	2				10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	5	4	15	2	4					30
Course failure in Math	4	2	8	6	6	11				37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				2	15	23				40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				1	14	20				35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	4	15	5	16						40
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	5	6	8	10	8					37

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	11	13	10	22	28				90

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										0
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

Data for 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*	73	68	59	71	66	57	68	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	80	71	59	73	69	58	70	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	68	63	60	66	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65	56	56	52	55	57			
Math Achievement*	78	69	64	72	67	62	70	64	59
Math Learning Gains	80	65	63	71	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61	47	51	43	43	52			
Science Achievement	74	68	58	78	68	57	77	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	92	73	63	84	75	61	64	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	75%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	671
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
75%	68%	74%	70%	61%		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	52%	No		
English Language Learners	75%	No		
Asian Students	90%	No		
Black/African American Students	54%	No		
Hispanic Students	74%	No		
Multiracial Students	68%	No		
White Students	75%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	65%	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	73%	80%	68%	65%	78%	80%	61%	74%					92%
Students With Disabilities	47%	24%	67%	62%	46%	67%	52%	54%					
English Language Learners	67%	73%	63%	60%	73%	92%		80%					92%
Asian Students	87%	92%	88%		95%	100%		75%					
Black/African American Students	49%	50%	75%		54%	70%	50%	29%					
Hispanic Students	72%	86%	63%	63%	73%	72%	62%	76%					100%
Multiracial Students	68%	60%	69%		68%	75%							
White Students	79%	83%	65%	56%	84%	85%	63%	87%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	60%	71%	71%	61%	68%	48%	58%					93%
22/2025													

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	71%	73%	66%	52%	72%	71%	43%	78%					84%
Students With Disabilities	43%	50%	52%	41%	47%	56%	45%	44%					
English Language Learners	64%		67%	64%	72%	70%	40%	77%					84%
Asian Students	79%	81%	60%		95%	85%		55%					
Black/African American Students	47%	67%	36%	25%	35%	38%	40%	40%					
Hispanic Students	67%	60%	70%	61%	66%	69%	36%	84%					88%
Multiracial Students	71%		75%		81%	83%							
White Students	78%	82%	68%	57%	79%	75%	48%	84%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	61%	60%	46%	58%	70%	49%	66%					79%

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	68%	70%			70%			77%					64%
Students With Disabilities	34%	71%			32%			43%					
English Language Learners	50%	59%			63%			60%					86%
Asian Students	73%				79%			93%					
Black/African American Students	41%	53%			28%			27%					
Hispanic Students	64%	66%			64%			64%					86%
Multiracial Students	69%				63%								
White Students	77%	79%			82%			94%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	61%			51%			52%					81%

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	72%	69%	3%	57%	15%
ELA	4	69%	67%	2%	56%	13%
ELA	5	68%	64%	4%	56%	12%
Math	3	75%	70%	5%	63%	12%
Math	4	68%	69%	-1%	62%	6%
Math	5	68%	46%	22%	57%	11%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	72%	66%	6%	55%	17%

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?

ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile increased from 52% to 65%. Math learning Gains increased from 71% to 80% among all students, and from 43% to 61% for the lowest quartile. The school focused on improving the quality of student teaming and discourse in the 2024-2025 school year and will work to refine the process in 2025-2026.

Lowest Performance

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

Science scores went from 78% of students at Level 3 or above to 74%. Science is not consistently taught at grade levels below fifth grade.

Greatest Decline

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

Though one may not consider that ELA achievement in 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 went from 71% to 73%, the data infers that grade level teachers need to be intentional about ensuring all students have understanding during core content instruction.

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.

Evans consistently scored above the state average, and above or equal to the district average for students performing at Level 3 or above in ELA, Math and Science. Considering those results and drilling down to subgroup performance, the focus will be on increasing the percent of SWDs meeting proficiency in ELA. The subgroup Students with Disabilities had 47% of students achieving Level 3 or above, compared to the category All Students meeting proficiency at 73% The gap between these two groups has each increased overall, but has not closed.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

The number of course failures among first grade students in both ELA and Math is concerning. The school implemented the practice of student discourse through "teaming" in 24-25. Because this is a new strategy focus for the school, it will need some analysis for how well students are interacting together, and how teachers are making adjustments to core instruction as they check for student understanding.

Highest Priorities

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

Increase the percent of SWD students achieving at Level 3 or above in ELA from 47% to 54% or higher.

Increase the percent of students achieving at Level 3 or above in Science from 74% to 79%

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 Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

The school is working on effective student discourse through academic teaming in core content areas. We will continue to grow this practice to ensure that students are able to demonstrate understanding and show critical thinking and comprehension as they process science content.

Measurable Outcome

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

Science achievement in 2023-2024 was 78% of all students scoring at Level 3 or above. Science achievement for SWD students was 44%.

Science achievement in 2024-2025 was 74% of all students scoring Level 3 or above. Science achievement for SWD students was 54%.

The expected outcome for all students achieving Level 3 or above on the science assessment will increase from 74% to 79% or higher.

The expected outcome for SWD students achieving Level 3 will increase from 47% to 54% or higher

Monitoring

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

- Data reviews with teachers
- Data reviews with PLCs
- Walkthrough monitoring of small group instruction in both ELA and Science
- Walkthrough monitoring of student discourse and teacher feedback in both ELA and Science
- Monitoring will be done using the Instructional Priorities tools for explicit teaching and learning:
 - benchmark-aligned instruction
 - monitoring for learning
 - student engagement

- conditions for learning

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Teachers will monitor and ensure that students are adequately participating in iReady personalized instruction in reading comprehension and effectively use Magnetic Reading for comprehension strategies and practice.

Rationale:

ELA and Science both require students to comprehend complex text and analyze information in order to understand what the text is conveying to the reader.

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

Monitor the effectiveness of academic learning teaming

Person Monitoring:

Pam Gamble, Sharon Klein

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Walkthroughs will be conducted to observe how students engage in content discussion and problem solving as Kagan structures are used to provide those opportunities. Kagan structures are becoming more prevalent in classrooms, but student discourse is at a recall level. Monitoring will be done using the Instructional Priorities tools for explicit teaching and learning: benchmark-aligned instruction monitoring for learning student engagement conditions for learning

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.

The school is working on effective student discourse through academic teaming in core content areas. We will continue to grow this practice to ensure that students are able to demonstrate understanding and show critical thinking and comprehension as they process science content.

Measurable Outcome

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

ELA Achievement in 2024-2025 showed the following individual grade results for Level 3 and above:

Second grade: 65%

Third grade: 72%

Fourth grade: 69%

Fifth grade: 68%

The expected outcome for all students achieving Level 3 or above in each grade level will increase as follows:

Second grade: from 65% to 70%

Third grade from 72% to 77%

Fourth grade from 69% to 74%

Fifth grade from 68% to 73%

Monitoring

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

- Data reviews with teachers
- Data reviews with PLCs
- Walkthrough monitoring of small group instruction in both ELA and Science
- Walkthrough monitoring of student discourse and teacher feedback
- Monitoring will be done using the Instructional Priorities tools for explicit teaching and learning:
 - benchmark-aligned instruction
 - monitoring for learning
 - student engagement
 - conditions for learning

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Teachers will monitor and ensure that students are adequately participating in iReady personalized instruction in reading comprehension and effectively use Magnetic Reading for comprehension strategies and practice.

Rationale:

ELA and Science both require students to comprehend complex text and analyze information in order to understand what the text is conveying to the reader. We will be working on connecting the reading strategies in both of these content areas this year.

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

Monitor the effectiveness of academic teaming

Person Monitoring:

Pam Gamble, Sharon Klein

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Walkthroughs will be conducted to observe how students engage in content discussion and problem solving as Kagan structures are used to provide those opportunities. Kagan structures are becoming more prevalent in classrooms, but student discourse is at a recall level. Monitoring will be done using the Instructional Priorities tools for explicit teaching and learning: benchmark-aligned instruction monitoring for learning student engagement conditions for learning

Area of Focus #3

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 school is working on effective student discourse through academic teaming in core content areas. We will continue to grow this practice to ensure that students are able to demonstrate understanding and show critical thinking and comprehension as they process science content.

Measurable Outcome

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

Math achievement in 2024-2025 was 78% for all students. Learning gains of the lowest quartile were 61%. The goal for 2025-2026 is to increase the percent of students in the lowest quartile from 61% to 65% or higher,

Monitoring

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

- Data reviews with teachers
- Data reviews with PLCs
- Walkthrough monitoring of small group instruction
- Walkthrough monitoring of student discourse and teacher feedback
- Monitoring will be done using the Instructional Priorities tools for explicit teaching and learning:
 - benchmark-aligned instruction
 - monitoring for learning
 - student engagement
 - conditions for learning

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Teachers will monitor the progress of all students falling into the lowest quartile and ensure that differentiated instruction and small group teacher support is meeting the needs of each learner. Students falling into the lowest quartile will be assigned to specific skill math intervention groups. Teachers will monitor the personalized instruction pathways in iReady to ensure that students are practicing the targeted skills

Rationale:

Students in the lowest quartile may be missing foundational skills necessary to solve complex and multi-step problems.

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

Monitor the effectiveness of academic teaming

Person Monitoring:

Pam Gamble, Sharon Klein

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Walkthroughs will be conducted to observe how students engage in content discussion and problem solving as Kagan structures are used to provide those opportunities. Kagan structures are becoming more prevalent in classrooms, but student discourse is at a recall level. Monitoring will be done using the Instructional Priorities tools for explicit teaching and learning: benchmark-aligned instruction monitoring for learning student engagement conditions for learning

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.

The breakdown of students by grade with attendance below 90% is listed below.

K- 9

1st - 13

2nd - 13

3rd - 11

4th - 12

5th - 6

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 school has decreased the percent of students missing 10% or more of school days. The goal for 2024-2025 was met with only 64 students in grades K-5 missing 10% or more school days.

The goal for 2025-2026 will be to decrease the number of students absent from school 10% or more school days by 25%

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.

Weekly attendance reports will be reviewed at leadership meetings and shared with teachers and the school social worker. Teachers will call students who are absent 3 or more days per quarter to check in and connect with them and their parents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Sharon Klein

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:

State statute requires that school teams shall be diligent in facilitating intervention services and make all reasonable efforts to resolve nonattendance behavior. Using the MTSS problem-solving model, teams are responsible for providing and monitoring appropriate interventions for individual students. To ensure students are provided with the necessary resources and interventions, school should form comprehensive teams with clear roles and responsibilities.

Rationale:

Through the use of evidence-based intervention supports, schools invest in fostering a culture that promotes engagement and attendance. However, some students struggle to attend school regularly. Unchecked absences can lead to lower achievement levels and gaps in knowledge that may prove challenging to overcome. It is critical for students and families to understand that absence due to arriving late, or missing full days, whether excused or unexcused can negatively affect learning. Efforts to curb tardiness, chronic absenteeism, and truancy can address the needs of students and families, mitigating student failure.

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

Preventative Measures for Attendance

Person Monitoring:

Sharon Klein

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Data reports will be shared in leadership meetings and meetings with the School Social Worker, DMHC and teachers. Parent meetings. will be set up as needed. Ongoing information and attendance tips will be sent out regularly to all stakeholders. Weekly attendance reports will be included in the principal's newsletter, sent electronically through Parent Square.

Area of Focus #2

Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Focus will be placed on establishing connections with all stakeholders for the principal, new to the school for the 2025-2026 school year. The leadership team will continue to build on connections that ultimately ensure that staff feel connected to administration and supported by their colleagues and administration.

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.

A minimum of 80% of teachers and staff will feel connected to other adults at Evans Elementary by the culminating survey.

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.

- Administration will be visible to staff and available for check-ins throughout the week
- Survey results
- Feedback from Team Leader and Office Staff meetings
- Feedback from Support Team meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Pam Gamble, Sharon Klein

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:

Monthly culture activities where staff engages with others not on their team, one early release per month, 1:1 check ins with administration and staff each semester. Cookies & Conversation monthly with individual teams to build comfort between teachers and administrators through conversation not directly related to job performance, student performance or other task-based conversations.

Rationale:

When teachers and staff feel comfortable interacting with administrators outside their respective offices, they tend to feel connected and valued as individuals who are striving to do their best at work.

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

Cookies & Conversation

Person Monitoring:

Pam Gamble

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Informal gatherings with each team will take place with the principal, and the assistant principal. The goal will be to get to know each other outside of a task-based environment and to enjoy the company of one another. There is no set agenda, and all are encouraged to participate and enjoy the snacks provided by the principal.

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