

Seminole County Public Schools

WALKER 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 29

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 32

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 35

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 36

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

Joan Walker Elementary School will provide a positive learning environment that ensures cooperation, mutual respect, and the optimum development of the whole child. We will teach our students to think critically, to act responsibly, and to perform successfully in order to become lifelong learners and responsible citizens in a technological and diverse global society.

Provide the school's vision statement

Walker Elementary School will be a top five school in SCPS. Walker will be recognized at the district and the state level for high standards, academic performance, and offering students customized educational pathways 24/7/365. Walker will support the SCPS vision that every student will graduate from high school prepared for the future as a lifelong learner and a responsible citizen in a democratic society. All students will perform at the highest levels. There will be equitable facilities and opportunities for all students. The school personnel will be highly qualified, diverse, innovative, enthusiastic, energetic, and dedicated to the mission. All students will accelerate beyond proficiency to mastery.

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

Kelly Mitchell

kelly_mitchell@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Principal provides the school-based leadership required to sustain a focus of improving instruction for the purpose of increasing the achievement of all students in a safe learning environment while ensuring the orderly and efficient operation of the school.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Alberto Quiroga

alberto_quiroga@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Assistant Principal supports the principal in providing the school-based leadership required to sustain a focus of improving instruction for the purpose of increasing the achievement of all students in a safe learning environment while ensuring the orderly and efficient operation of the school.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Jacqueline Allbritton

jacqueline_allbritton@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Instructional Coach collaborates with teachers to develop and support a strategic plan for improving classroom instruction in areas determined by key school improvement goals.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Stephanie Bostrom

stephanie_bostrom@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Instructional Coach collaborates with teachers to develop and support a strategic plan for improving classroom instruction in areas determined by key school improvement goals.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Jenne Marino

marinojm@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The School Counselor develops and provides an effective comprehensive guidance and counseling program, works with students and parents to help guide students' academic, behavioral and social growth and assists with facilitating student study.

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.

Walker Elementary works closely with all stakeholders to ensure every voice is heard and opinions are considered when making decisions. The school will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and the school faculty at the beginning of the school year. These groups are made up of teachers, faculty, parents, and community members. The SIP will be presented to all stakeholders.

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)).

Input on SIP development will be received from school stakeholders at the start of the year. Additionally, SIP goals and action steps will be revisited throughout the year to monitor progress. State and district progress monitoring data will be analyzed and used to modify plans, as needed. Data for targeted groups with the greatest achievement gaps, such as the lowest quartile, will be closely monitored and disaggregated.

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	24.8%
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) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) 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	49	73	101	96	107	110				536
Absent 10% or more school days	1	5	4	7	8	7				32
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0				3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	4	8	1	0	0				14
Course failure in Math	1	5	5	2	3	0				16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	2	10	18	5	6				41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	1	6	12	5	5				29
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	11	14	10					39
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	5	8	7	0	2				22

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	1	7	12	16	9	1				46

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	1	2	2	2	0	0				7
Students retained two or more times										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		14	18	10	11	4				57
One or more suspensions										0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		1	9	3	1					14
Course failure in Math		3	5	2		2				12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				2	3	7				12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				1	4	11				16
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	12	17						38
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		13	20	20	2					55

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		10	10	18	2					40

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	2	3						6
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*	74	68	59	81	66	57	73	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	75	71	59	81	69	58	74	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	66	63	60	68	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55	56	56	57	55	57			
Math Achievement*	80	69	64	77	67	62	79	64	59
Math Learning Gains	75	65	63	67	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60	47	51	39	43	52			
Science Achievement	83	68	58	88	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)	73		63		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	71%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	568
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
71%	70%	76%	72%	64%		65%

* 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		
Asian Students	90%	No		
Hispanic Students	75%	No		
Multiracial Students	73%	No		
White Students	68%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	63%	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	74%	75%	66%	55%	80%	75%	60%	83%					
Students With Disabilities	36%	35%	47%	38%	40%	50%	33%	65%					
Asian Students	96%		80%		93%	90%							
Hispanic Students	74%	78%	63%	56%	84%	82%	88%	75%					
Multiracial Students	60%		75%		73%	83%							
White Students	73%	74%	64%	56%	78%	68%	46%	84%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	62%	48%	62%	56%	70%	72%	61%	70%					

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.
All Students	81%	81%	68%	57%	77%	67%	39%	88%		
Students With Disabilities	47%	43%	55%	52%	34%	36%	26%	47%		
Asian Students	88%	86%	71%		91%	88%				
Hispanic Students	76%	76%	70%	59%	72%	54%	13%	83%		
Multiracial Students	82%		70%		88%	90%				
White Students	81%	84%	66%	53%	77%	69%	48%	87%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	73%	79%	65%	57%	57%	41%	20%	73%		

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	73%	74%			79%			77%					64%
Students With Disabilities	42%	53%			46%			36%					
English Language Learners	55%				73%								
Asian Students	84%				84%			70%					
Hispanic Students	67%	66%			73%			65%					
Multiracial Students	83%				83%								
White Students	74%	76%			81%			80%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	58%	50%			58%			67%					

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	75%	69%	6%	57%	18%
ELA	4	76%	67%	9%	56%	20%
ELA	5	70%	64%	6%	56%	14%
Math	3	77%	70%	7%	63%	14%
Math	4	76%	69%	7%	62%	14%
Math	5	73%	46%	27%	57%	16%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	81%	66%	15%	55%	26%

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?

Based on FAST data from Spring 2024 to Spring 2025, Walker Elementary improved in Math in all accountability areas. Math was an area of focus school-wide during the 2024-2025 school year. The highest amount of growth was seen in the category of Math Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile, increasing from 39% to 60%. In the SWD subgroup, Math Learning Gains improved from 36% to 50%. Additionally, overall Math Achievement increased from 77% to 80% and Math Learning Gains increased from 67% to 75%. In the SWD subgroup, Science Achievement also increased from 47% to 65%. Actions resulting in Math increases included support for teachers with regularly implementing small group differentiated instruction, increased push-in services for SWD through support facilitation, targeted in-school tutorial and frequent monitoring and feedback during the math block.

Lowest Performance

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

Based on FAST data from Spring 2024 to Spring 2025, Walker Elementary slightly decreased in ELA in all accountability areas. Overall ELA Achievement moved from 81% to 74%, 3rd Grade ELA Achievement moved from 81% to 75%, ELA Learning Gains decreased from 68% to 66% and ELA Low Quartile Learning Gains decreased from 57% to 55%. Contributing factors to this decrease in ELA performance included a focus on improving Math Achievement and Learning Gains last school year with more frequent targeted support and professional development for teachers in Math than in ELA, a shift after the start of the school year in the SCPS curriculum project and support facilitation services plan and variance among teachers in consistency of implementing district shifts in daily, systematic guided reading.

Greatest Decline

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

An area of notable decline was ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile within the SWD subgroup, which decreased from 52% in Spring 2024 to 38% in Spring 2025. Contributing factors to this decrease in SWD ELA Low Quartile Learning Gains included a focus on improving Math Achievement

and Learning Gains last school year with more frequent targeted support and professional development for teachers in Math than in ELA, a shift after the start of the school year in the SCPS curriculum project and support facilitation services plan and variance among teachers in consistency of implementing district shifts in daily, systematic guided reading.

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.

Walker consistently scores above the state and district average. However, in 5th grade Reading Achievement, 3rd grade Math Achievement and 4th grade Math Achievement, Walker scored +14 above the state average, which is not as high over the state average as some areas, such as 4th grade ELA Achievement (+20 above state average). There is not a noted achievement gap between Walker and the state average.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

An area of concern based on the Early Warning System (EWS) data is 3rd grade Attendance and ELA. Third grade reading proficiency is identified as a high priority area of focus. EWS data indicates that 3rd grade has the highest number of students missing 10% or more of the school year, scoring Level 1 on the state STAR/FAST assessment in Spring 2025 and identified as having a Substantial Reading Deficiency (SRD).

Highest Priorities

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

The highest priorities for school improvement for the 2025-2026 school year are:

- 1) Increase ELA Learning Gains and Achievement of SWD subgroup.
- 2) Increase Math Learning Gains and Achievement of SWD subgroup.
- 3) Increase 3rd grade ELA Achievement.
- 4) Increase overall (3rd-5th) ELA Achievement.
- 5) Increase ELA Learning Gains of Low Quartile.

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.

ELA Learning Gains of the Low Quartile and ELA Learning Gains and Achievement of the SWD subgroup are identified areas of concern in Reading. Based on Spring 2025 data, 55% of Low Quartile students made a Learning Gain, 36% of SWD students were proficient in Reading, 47% made a Learning Gain and 38% of SWD students in the Low Quartile made a Learning Gain.

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.

In order to close the achievement gap for identified students, our goal is to increase the Reading accountability measures as follows:

- Increase ELA Low Quartile Learning Gains from 55% to 65%.
- Increase SWD ELA Achievement from 36% to 65%.
- Increase SWD ELA Learning Gains from 47% to 65%.
- Increase SWD ELA Low Quartile Learning Gains from 38% to 65%.

Monitoring

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

ELA Learning Gains of the Low Quartile and ELA Achievement and Learning Gains of the SWD subgroup will be monitored in a variety of ways. Data spreadsheets will be utilized to track targeted students' progress across assessments, regular MTSS meetings will be held to discuss student learning and response to interventions, a data wall will be implemented in the PLC planning room for target students, and teachers will monitor the progress of low quartile and SWD students during small group differentiated instruction and through classroom assessment data analysis. Additionally, classroom walkthroughs will be conducted, and formative feedback provided, by the school leadership team during designated small group differentiated instruction blocks using the SCPS

Instructional Priorities tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

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). For students with disabilities who are served in separate classroom environments for the majority of the instructional day, additional curriculum has been included to address reading deficits as needed: Reading Mastery (promising evidence) and Corrective Reading (strong evidence). English Language Learners may also utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy (promising evidence) and Imagine Learning Espanol (promising 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

Assess Oral Reading Fluency and Comprehension

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

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

Teachers will implement the SCPS K–5 Reading Assessment Flowchart, including Oral Reading

Fluency with Comprehension (ORF), every six weeks. Grades 2–5 begin in Quarter 1; Grade 1 begins mid-year. ORF assesses rate, accuracy, prosody, and basic comprehension. Instructional coaches and administrators will support implementation. During PLCs, teachers will analyze ORF data to select targeted fluency-building strategies and materials.

Action Step #2

Daily Small Group Differentiated Instruction for Reading

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto On-Going Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

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

Teachers will plan and deliver benchmark-aligned, small group differentiated instruction using current student data. During weekly PLCs and ongoing professional development, instructional coaches and administrators will support this work. Teachers will regularly use high-impact resources—such as Standards Mastery, iReady Toolkit, and core guided reading materials—to meet students' targeted needs, with a focus on Low Quartile and SWD subgroups. Reading groups will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, formative feedback using the SCPS Instructional Priorities tool, district look-fors, and collaboration with Dr. Wentzl.

Action Step #3

Implement Station Teaching for Reading Support Facilitation

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto On-Going Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

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

Teachers will follow the master schedule for designated small-group ELA push-in and ESE support blocks. ESE teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings and plan small group lessons collaboratively with general education teachers. Instructional coaches and administrators will conduct regular walkthroughs to monitor implementation and provide feedback using the SCPS Instructional Practices tool. A simple tracking sheet will be used to document trends in co-teaching and station teaching implementation fidelity.

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.

Math Learning Gains and Achievement of the SWD subgroup is an identified area of concern in Math. Based on Spring 2025 data, 40% of SWD students were proficient in Math, 50% made a Learning Gain and 33% in the Low Quartile made a Learning Gain.

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.

In order to close the achievement gap for identified students, our goal is to increase the Math accountability measures as follows:

- Increase SWD Math Achievement from 40% to 65%.
- Increase SWD Math Learning Gains from 50% to 65%.
- Increase SWD Math Low Quartile Learning Gains from 33% to 65%.

Monitoring

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

Math Achievement and Learning Gains of the SWD subgroup will be monitored in a variety of ways. Data spreadsheets will be utilized to track targeted students' progress across assessments, regular MTSS meetings will be held to discuss student learning and response to interventions, a data wall will be implemented in the PLC planning room for target students, and teachers will monitor the progress of SWD students during small group differentiated instruction and through classroom assessment data analysis. Additionally, classroom walkthroughs will be conducted, and formative feedback provided, by the school leadership team during designated small group differentiated instruction blocks using the SCPS Instructional Priorities tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

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

Daily Small Group Differentiated Instruction for Math

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

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

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

Teachers will plan and deliver benchmark-aligned small group math instruction using current student data, with a focus on SWD subgroups. Instructional coaches and administrators will support this work through weekly PLCs and ongoing professional development. Teachers will regularly use high-impact resources—such as Standards Mastery, iReady Toolkit, and core curriculum materials—to meet students' targeted needs. Implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and formative feedback using the SCPS Instructional Priorities tool and district math group look-fors.

Action Step #2

Implement Station Teaching for Math Support Facilitation

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

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

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

Teachers will follow the master schedule for designated small-group Math push-in and ESE support blocks. ESE teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings and plan small group lessons collaboratively with general education teachers. Instructional coaches and administrators will conduct regular walkthroughs to monitor implementation and provide feedback using the SCPS Instructional Practices tool. A simple tracking sheet will be used to document trends in co-teaching and station teaching implementation fidelity.

Area of Focus #3

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.

ELA Achievement is an identified area for improvement in Reading. Based on Spring 2025 data, 74% of 3rd-5th grade students were proficient in Reading and 75% of 3rd grade students were proficient in Reading.

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.

In order to raise Achievement for all students, our goal is to increase the Reading accountability measures as follows:

- Increase ELA Achievement from 74% to 80%.
- Increase 3rd grade ELA Achievement from 75% to 80%.

Monitoring

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

ELA Achievement will be monitored in a variety of ways. Data spreadsheets will be utilized to track targeted students' progress across assessments, regular MTSS meetings will be held to discuss student learning and response to interventions, a data wall will be implemented in the PLC planning room for target students, and teachers will monitor the progress of students during PLC discussions focused on assessment data analysis, planning small group differentiated instruction, and utilizing Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) to plan for core instruction. Additionally, classroom walkthroughs will be conducted, and formative feedback provided, by the school leadership team during designated whole group and small group differentiated instruction blocks using the SCPS Instructional Priorities tool.

.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

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). For students with disabilities who are served in separate classroom environments for the majority of the instructional day, additional curriculum has been included to address reading deficits as needed: Reading Mastery (promising evidence) and Corrective Reading (strong evidence). English Language Learners may also utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy (promising evidence) and Imagine Learning Espanol (promising 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

Benchmark-Aligned Lesson Planning and Implementation

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto On-Going
Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton,
Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom,
Instructional Coach

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

Teachers will plan and deliver rigorous, benchmark-aligned Tier 1 reading instruction using the SCPS Frameworks and Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs). Instructional coaches and administrators will support this work through weekly PLCs and ongoing professional development. Teachers will ensure students engage with appropriately complex texts and build independent reading stamina. Core instruction will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and formative feedback using the SCPS Instructional Priorities tool, district reading look-fors, and collaboration with Dr. Wentzl.

Action Step #2

Assess Oral Reading Fluency and Comprehension

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto On-Going
Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton,

Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom,
Instructional Coach

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

Teachers will implement the SCPS K–5 Reading Assessment Flowchart, including Oral Reading Fluency with Comprehension (ORF), every six weeks. Grades 2–5 begin in Quarter 1; Grade 1 begins mid-year. ORF assesses rate, accuracy, prosody, and basic comprehension. Instructional coaches and administrators will support implementation. During PLCs, teachers will analyze ORF data to select targeted fluency-building strategies and materials.

Action Step #3

Increase Students' Reading Stamina and Engagement

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

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

Teachers will use on-grade-level, appropriately challenging texts and build students' independent reading stamina through engagement strategies such as student collaboration, academic vocabulary, and tasks that require explaining thinking. Reading engagement and stamina will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and formative feedback using the SCPS Instructional Priorities tool, district look-fors, and collaboration with Dr. Wentzl.

Area of Focus #4

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.

Based on Spring 2025 school grade data, 83% of 5th grade students scored level 3 or above on the state Science assessment. While Walker's Science Achievement remains well-above the state and district average, this will be an area of focus in order to maintain the high levels of proficiency Walker has achieved over the last two school years.

Measurable Outcome

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

The measurable outcome for this area of focus will be to increase Science Achievement from 83% in Spring 2025 to 88% in Spring 2026.

Monitoring

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

Science Achievement will be monitored in a variety of ways. Data spreadsheets will be utilized to track students' progress on classroom and district assessments, regular PLC meetings will be used to plan high-quality, highly engaging science lessons and labs, instructional coaches will provide ongoing support for implementation of the newly-adopted science curriculum, and results from the district Science Benchmark assessment will be analyzed and used to adjust planning and instruction based on identified areas of need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

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: McGraw Hill Science, McGraw Hill Explore Labs and Simulations, Page Keeley Science Probes, and LearnSmart (grades 3-5).

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

Implement Hands on Science Labs

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton, Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

On-Going

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

step:

Hands on labs, investigations, and simulations are included in the adopted McGraw Hill science curriculum. Labs should take place every 1-2 weeks. During PLC meetings, instructional coaches and administrators will support teachers with the planning and implementation of hands-on science labs.

Action Step #2

Read and Write About Informational Texts

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

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto On-Going
Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton,
Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom,
Instructional Coach

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

Students should be reading and writing with informational text in all grade levels weekly. During PLC meetings, instructional coaches and administrators will support teachers with the planning and implementation of processing and engagement strategies to allow students to read and write about science texts.

Action Step #3

Build Vocabulary Expertise

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

Leadership Team: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto On-Going
Quiroga, Assistant Principal; Jackie Allbritton,
Instructional Coach; Stephanie Bostrom,
Instructional Coach

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

Students should be interacting with academic vocabulary daily to strengthen science vocabulary and communication. During PLC meetings, instructional coaches and administrators will support teachers with the planning and implementation of lessons and strategies to build expertise with science and academic vocabulary.

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.

An identified area of concern based on Early Warning System data was the number of students in grade 3 (25) for the 25-26 school year with 10% or more of missed schools days last year. This is a critical area on which to focus for improved attendance due to the importance of proficiency in reading

by the end of 3rd grade.

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 measurable outcome for this area of focus will be to reduce the number of 3rd grade students missing 10% or more school days from 25 to 10 or fewer.

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 and truancy will be monitored in a variety of ways. A truancy data spreadsheet will be utilized to track targeted students' attendance and contact attempts to notify parent/guardian of truancy concerns. Teachers will send emails to parents/guardians when a student reaches 3 or 5 days of consecutive absence without notice or explanation. The school-based guidance team, including the school social worker, will meet regularly to review attendance data and plan for interventions, truancy meetings, or truancy referrals, as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal & Guidance Team: Jenne Marino, School Counselor; Jennifer Treco, SSW

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: MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 plans addressing attendance.

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

Improve Attendance of 3rd Grade Students

Person Monitoring:

Administration: Kelly Mitchell, Principal; Alberto Quiroga, Assistant Principal & Guidance Team: Jenne Marino, School Counselor; Jennifer Treco, SSW

By When/Frequency:

On-Going

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

Grade 3 teachers and the guidance team will monitor and support improved attendance, especially for students with 15+ absences last year. -Track attendance in PLCs and guidance team meetings. -Teachers will notify families at 3 and 5 consecutive absences. -SCPS truancy protocols, including parent letters for 5, 10, and 15 days absent, will be followed. -Implement targeted attendance incentives to encourage regular attendance. -Designate a staff mentor for 3rd grade students with 15+ absences last year to check-in and motivate students.

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