

Seminole County Public Schools

RAINBOW 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 27

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 31

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 34

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 35

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 Rainbow Elementary School is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens in our great country and in the global economy.

Provide the school's vision statement

Rainbow Elementary will provide an enriched learning environment for all students including developing a growth mind set, rigorous academic standards, and a positive, nurturing school culture to ensure the academic growth and success of every student.

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

Kristina Marshall

kristina_marshall@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversees all aspects of the school's operation including, but not limited to, staff, SAC, PTA, 5 Essentials, school budget, ESE, Title IX, Team Leaders, students, and instruction.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Jennifer Fennel

jennifer_fennel@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supports the principal in her role supporting the school with data analysis, 504s, MTSS, curriculum and instruction, communication with families, testing, scheduling, lesson plans, and social media.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Stacey Miller

stacey_miller@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supports the principal and assistant principal in their roles with responsibilities for the custodians, paraprofessionals, scheduling, school events, discipline, transportation, communication, and PBIS.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Hannah Metzger-Starcher

hannah_metzger-starcher@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supports students with 504's, IEP's, EP's, and individual or group counseling. The school counselor supports the school with PBIS, student study meetings, and works closely with the School Psychologist, District Mental Health Counselor, and Social Worker to ensure the students' counseling needs are being met. She supports the school with resiliency education, civic and character education, and life skills education.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Michele Fitzpatrick

michele_fitzpatrick@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provide teachers with on-going professional development related to instruction, model best practices, assist in analyzing student data, and support school wide progress resulting in an increase in student achievement.

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

Melisa Jones

melisa_jones@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Educational Technology Facilitator/Science Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provides coaching and support to teachers in the area of Science while coordinating, organizing, and facilitating instructional technology applications.

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.

School staff, parents, and community members are encouraged to actively participate in the development and review of the School Improvement Plan by attending School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. The SAC collaborates closely with the school, offering meaningful feedback to help establish shared goals that align with our school-wide vision. Input from teachers, staff, and the community gathered through various surveys is integral to the creation of a plan that drives school success. Additionally, Rainbow Elementary's PTA provides vital human and financial resources to support and enhance student achievement.

3. SIP Monitoring

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

Our school will implement a collaborative approach to reviewing school-wide and student-specific data. Regular data meetings will be held every six weeks, during which the leadership team will meet with each grade level to analyze student progress and adjust interventions based on identified needs. During these meetings, targeted action plans will be developed for intervention groups. The leadership team will monitor the fidelity of implementation, assign related tasks, and meet regularly to review and refine the action plans to ensure alignment with the school's overall improvement goals.

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	36.7%
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	93	104	129	104	121	128				679
Absent 10% or more school days	3	5	9	5	8	11				41
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	0	3				7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	22	15	0	3	4				44
Course failure in Math	0	12	4	0	3	10				29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	5	10	2	5	9				31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	3	2	5	8	9				27
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	11	21	1	9	0				42
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	22	15	4	0	7				48

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	18	19	4	7	14				62

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	8	2	0	1	0				11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1				1

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days		18	12	6	13	12				61
One or more suspensions				1	3					4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		3	9							12
Course failure in Math			4	1	4	3				12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					4	5				9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					4	9				13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		9	1	15						25
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		9	2	5	4					20

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		5	6	2	8	8				29

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		6	1	1						8
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*	88	68	59	84	66	57	78	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	89	71	59	89	69	58	84	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	80	63	60	74	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73	56	56	59	55	57			
Math Achievement*	88	69	64	90	67	62	78	64	59
Math Learning Gains	85	65	63	89	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72	47	51	76	43	52			
Science Achievement	90	68	58	89	68	57	80	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	95	73	63	95	75	61	81	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	84%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	760
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
84%	83%	84%	73%	71%		77%

* 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	65%	No		
English Language Learners	79%	No		
Asian Students	91%	No		
Black/African American Students	76%	No		
Hispanic Students	84%	No		
Multiracial Students	81%	No		
White Students	84%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	81%	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	88%	89%	80%	73%	88%	85%	72%	90%					95%
Students With Disabilities	65%	61%	69%	61%	58%	60%	60%	83%					
English Language Learners	79%		72%	73%	84%	72%							95%
Asian Students	88%				94%								
Black/African American Students	78%		79%		67%	79%							
Hispanic Students	91%	89%	85%	80%	86%	85%	68%	86%					
Multiracial Students	72%		77%		89%	85%							
White Students	89%	89%	79%	70%	90%	84%	79%	94%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	80%	86%	79%	68%	80%	77%	73%	83%					100%

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	84%	89%	74%	59%	90%	89%	76%	89%					95%
Students With Disabilities	63%	72%	68%	63%	62%	64%	50%	59%					
English Language Learners	56%	60%	56%		92%	75%							95%
Asian Students	78%		75%		96%	94%		79%					
Black/African American Students	79%		75%		79%	75%							
Hispanic Students	78%	83%	69%	46%	87%	87%	78%	73%					90%
Multiracial Students	78%		92%		83%	85%							
White Students	88%	93%	74%	61%	93%	91%	81%	99%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	74%	82%	70%	55%	84%	84%	73%	79%					93%

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	78%	84%			78%			80%					81%
Students With Disabilities	57%	68%			51%			58%					
English Language Learners	68%				74%								100%
Asian Students	74%				84%								
Black/African American Students	64%				64%								
Hispanic Students	74%	90%			64%			74%					
Multiracial Students	67%				71%								
White Students	82%	86%			86%			81%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	70%	78%			65%			72%					100%

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	87%	69%	18%	57%	30%
ELA	4	81%	67%	14%	56%	25%
ELA	5	91%	64%	27%	56%	35%
Math	3	88%	70%	18%	63%	25%
Math	4	86%	69%	17%	62%	24%
Math	5	76%	46%	30%	57%	19%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	89%	66%	23%	55%	34%

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?

The area in which we demonstrated the most significant improvement was in ELA learning gains among students in the lowest quartile. In the 2023–2024 school year, 59% of our lowest quartile students showed learning gains in ELA. In the 2024–2025 school year, that number increased to 73%. This growth can be attributed to several targeted instructional strategies. Students received guided support during whole group instruction and participated in targeted skill-based, small group lessons led by teachers. Student progress was regularly reviewed during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and formal data meetings held every six weeks. Based on this data, students were placed in flexible intervention groups during a designated intervention block, "Mission Possible." These groups are adjusted as student performance data evolves. Additionally, students were reviewed through the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process to identify and provide any additional supports needed for their success.

Lowest Performance

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

The area demonstrating the lowest performance was math learning gains among students in the lowest quartile. While 72% of these students showed learning gains, there is still room for growth. In some cases, core instruction may not have been sufficiently differentiated to address the diverse needs of struggling learners, which impacted student engagement and progress. During Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), student data was analyzed to identify support strategies that could be implemented during core instruction and to inform the use of targeted small groups within the math block. Additionally, students were reviewed through the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to determine additional needs and identify layered supports necessary to promote their academic success.

Greatest Decline

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

Our greatest area of decline was in math learning gains, with a 4% decrease observed in both overall student gains and those of students in the lowest quartile. In the 2023–2024 school year, 89% of students demonstrated learning gains in math, compared to 85% in the 2024–2025 school year. Similarly, 76% of our lowest quartile students made gains in 2023–2024, dropping to 72% in 2024–2025. Many of our lowest quartile students entered the school year with significant gaps in foundational math skills, which have not yet been fully addressed. These skill gaps continue to impact their ability to access grade-level content and make consistent progress.

Greatest Gap

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

The greatest gap compared to the state's data was observed in 6th grade math. While the state average was 60%, Rainbow Elementary School outperformed this benchmark by 40 percentage points, with 100% of our RAMP 5 students scoring proficient. Collaborative planning and regular data discussions contributed to this achievement. Our 5th grade teachers have a deep understanding of the 6th grade math standards and curriculum, enabling them to deliver high-quality, targeted instruction that effectively prepares RAMP 5 students for success.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Student Attendance: If attendance rates are below target levels, this can impact student learning and engagement, leading to achievement gaps.

Highest Priorities

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

- Rigorous small group instruction
- Student engagement
- Increase Math Learning Gains by 5%
- Increase Math Learning Gains for our lowest quartile by 5%
- Increase proficiency in all subject areas and grade levels by 5%

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.

Professional Learning will focus on implementing the instructional frameworks to identify and discuss best teaching practices for standards based and differentiated, rigorous, whole group and small group instruction to promote student engagement. Rainbow will continue to collaborate with teachers on effective instruction of the small group instruction and student rotations. Our instructional coach will work closely with the teachers, guiding them through student accountability during rotations. Teachers will be provided additional support and information regarding the B.E.S.T. Standards and how to implement the standards for student achievement through SCPS small group routines. Teachers will gain an in-depth understanding of how to group, pull, and instruct their students within a guided reading group. Leadership will use the small group instruction walk through and reflection tool to help teachers reflect on their practice to improve small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome

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

Our goal is for all students to achieve at least one year's growth in a year's time. Specifically, for our lowest quartile students, we aim to increase overall ELA proficiency by 5%, moving from 73% to 78%, and to achieve a 5% improvement across each component of the FAST assessment in ELA. Rainbow would like to see the following increases:

- **Third Grade ELA:** Increase proficiency from 89% to 94%
- **Fourth Grade ELA:** Increase proficiency from 81% to 86%
- **Fifth Grade ELA:** Increase proficiency from 91% to 96%

Monitoring

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

Guided reading groups and rotations will be monitored for rigorous academic instruction and student engagement. The leadership team will use the small group instructional walkthrough and reflection tool to provide feedback to teachers and support them in their instruction. Students will be strategically placed in small group settings during Mission Possible (intervention and acceleration) to focus on differentiated instruction aligned to their skill needs. The lowest quartile will be monitored regularly through Leadership team meetings, MTSS, and PLC data meetings with teachers. Weekly or biweekly data points, based on the specific skill, will be monitored to determine if the students receiving tiered interventions are learning the skills they are being taught. These data points will be entered into EdInsight for tracking purposes. An electronic data tracking form will be used for all students on campus to show the achievement level of each student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick, Literacy Coach; Kirsten Goldman, Instructional Coach; Melisa Jones, Educational Technology Facilitator; Teachers

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:

Using formative assessment data, students would be grouped according to their academic needs with evidence based interventions that fit their individual need including, but not limited to, UFLI, Magnetic Reading, district assessments, Oral Reading Fluency, Core Phonics Survey, Flamingo Phonemic Awareness Assessment, and I-Ready.

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

Utilize Best Instructional Practices

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

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel,
Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School
Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick,
Instructional Coach

May 2026

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

ELA teachers will participate in the 3rd-5th Small Group Reading Professional Learning Series to enhance their small group instructional practice. ELA teachers will implement daily small group instruction during Tier 1 Core instruction following the SCPS Instructional Frameworks which provide teachers guidance for Decoding, Fluency, and Comprehension small group lessons. *All K-2 ELA teachers will implement UFLI Foundations during Tier 1 Core instruction which provide teachers guidance for Phonics Skills, Decoding, and Fluency in whole and small group lesson.

Action Step #2

Focused Professional Learning Communities

Person Monitoring:

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel,
Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School
Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick,
Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

PLCs will bring the ELA B.E.S.T. Standards spirals and Achievement Level Descriptors when analyzing data and/or planning for instruction. ALDs will provide clear guidance on what is needed to move up a level within a given standard. PLCs will also plan for the use of formative assessments to monitor understanding and guide instruction to ensure we are meeting the needs of each student.

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.

Professional Learning will focus on implementing the instructional frameworks to identify and discuss best teaching practices for standards based and differentiated, rigorous, whole group and small group instruction to promote student engagement. To accelerate learning, Rainbow will continue to collaborate with teachers on effective instruction of the Math curriculum and student rotations. Our instructional coach will work closely with the teachers, guiding them through student accountability during rotations. District support, along with our instructional coach, will assist teachers in creating rigorous and engaging small group lessons to address the needs of each student. Teachers will be provided additional support and information regarding the B.E.S.T. Standards and how to implement the standards for student achievement. Teachers will gain an in-depth understanding of how to group,

pull, and instruct their students within a Math small group.

Measurable Outcome

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

Our goal is for all students to achieve at least one year's growth in a year's time. For our lowest quartile students, we aim to increase overall math proficiency by 5% and achieve a 5% improvement across each component of the FAST assessment in math. Rainbow would like to see the following increases:

- **Third Grade:** Increase proficiency from 88% to 93%
- **Fourth Grade:** Increase proficiency from 86% to 91%
- **Fifth Grade (Non-RAMP):** Increase proficiency from 76% to 81%
- **Fifth Grade (RAMP):** Maintain 100% proficiency

Monitoring

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

During grade level PLCs, all curriculum areas will be monitored. Formal and informal assessments will be discussed to determine progress towards mastery of the standard. Math small groups and rotations will be monitored for rigorous academic instruction and student engagement. The lowest quartile will be monitored regularly through Leadership team meetings, MTSS, and PLC data meetings with teachers. Weekly or biweekly data points, based on the specific skill, will be monitored to determine if the students are learning the skills they are being taught. These data points will be entered into EdInsight for tracking purposes. An electronic data tracking form will be used for all students on campus to show the achievement level of each student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick, 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:

Using formative assessment data, students would be grouped according to their academic needs with evidence based interventions that fit their need including, but not limited to Saavas, iReady, and Ready Florida's BEST Mathematics.

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 math to be addressed according to student data. All of the listed evidence based interventions have been included in the K-5 District Instructional Materials Matrix for Elementary Instructional Supports.

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?

Yes

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

Utilizing Best Instructional Practices

Person Monitoring:

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

All Math teachers will implement daily small group instruction during Tier 1 Core instruction following the SCPS Instructional Frameworks. UF Coaches will use a small group "look for" tool to assess the needs of teachers and provide teachers with specific professional learning opportunities to collaborate using collaborative structures and build understanding of small group instructional routines to increase rigor and student engagement during math rotations.

Action Step #2

Focused Professional Learning Communities

Person Monitoring:

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

PLCs will bring the Math B.E.S.T. Standards spirals and Achievement Level Descriptors when analyzing data and/or planning for instruction. PLCs will plan and implement in-house formative assessments a minimum of 2 times in each math unit. The PLCs will plan for the use of Standards Mastery Assessments by identifying which to use within a given unit or time frame, what format(s) to use, and with which students.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Professional Learning will focus on implementing the instructional frameworks to identify and discuss best teaching practices for standards based and differentiated, rigorous, instruction to promote student engagement. To accelerate learning, Rainbow will continue to collaborate with teachers on effective instruction of the Science Curriculum, utilizing labs, and regular hands on experiences. Our instructional coach will work closely with the teachers, guiding them through student accountability during labs. District support, along with our instructional coaches, will assist teachers with Science curriculum and consistent terminology across the campus. District personnel will also assist our coaches with Science and STEAM initiatives to accelerate our students in those curriculum areas.

Measurable Outcome

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

Our goal is to increase our proficiency overall by 5% on our Science State Assessment from 90% to 95%. The goal is for all students to achieve proficiency and demonstrate mastery of grade level standards.

Monitoring

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

During grade level PLCs, teachers will plan for hands on experiences and labs to address to Florida Science standards. Formal and informal assessments will be discussed to determine progress towards mastery of the standards. The lowest quartile will be monitored regularly through Leadership team meetings and PLC data meetings with teachers. Weekly or biweekly data points, based on the specific skill, will be monitored to determine if the students are learning the skills they are being taught.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick, Instructional Coach; Melisa Jones, Educational Technology Facilitator/ Science Instructional Coach; Teachers

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:

Using formative assessment data, students would be grouped according to their academic needs with evidence based interventions that fit their need using the McGraw-Hill series intervention supports, collaborative structures, and hands on labs.

Rationale:

The use of collaborative structures and hands on experiences will allow students to access the Florida Science standards in a variety of ways with students being active participants in their learning.

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

Utilizing Best Instructional Practices

Person Monitoring:

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick, Instructional Coach; Melisa Jones, Educational Technology Facilitator/Science Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

Teachers will use effective instruction using hands on labs increasing student engagement. Our instructional coach will work closely with the teachers, guiding them through student accountability during Science labs. Teachers will use consistent terminology across the campus.

Action Step #2

Focused Professional Learning Communities

Person Monitoring:

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Michele Fitzpatrick, Instructional Coach; Melisa Jones, Educational Technology Facilitator/Science Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

PLCs will focus on implementing the Science Instructional Frameworks to identify and discuss best teaching practices for standards based instruction including hands on experiences and labs. During PLCs, district personnel will assist our coach with Science and STEAM initiatives to accelerate our students in those curriculum areas. Instructional coach will collaborate with teachers on ways to incorporate academic Science terminology across grade levels.

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.

During the 2024-2025 school year, Rainbow had 92 students (13%) of our students with 15 or more absences. Student learning is significantly affected by excessive absences with students missing core instruction.

Measurable Outcome

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

During the 2024–2025 school year, 92 students (13%) had 15 or more absences. Our goal for the 2025–2026 school year is to decrease this percentage to 10%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly student attendance meetings will be held to review student attendance data. Students with 10 or more absences will be flagged for further review, and reports will be shared with the principal for additional follow-up. Targeted attendance initiatives, family engagement efforts, and support strategies to address barriers will be closely monitored to ensure they are effectively contributing to improved attendance and positively impacting student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Hannah Starcher, School Counselor; Teachers

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, schools 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 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

Weekly Review Meetings

Person Monitoring:

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Hannah Starcher, School Counselor; Mindy Nierenhausen, District School Social Worker

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

*Attendance Team that consists of the School Counselor, SAM, Assistant Principal, Guidance Secretary, Front Office Secretary, and Social Worker will meet weekly to discuss truancy and attendance patterns. *School counselor will communicate with parents the impact of regular attendance on their student's academic success in our weekly parent newsletter. *School counselor will communicate regularly with parents of students with chronic absences. *Student attendance will be analyzed during weekly Leadership Team meetings. *Student attendance will be shared with teachers quarterly. *Student attendance will be shared with the School Advisory Committee quarterly.

Area of Focus #2

Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Behavior Coaching Academy and PBIS initiatives will support building the consistency with the

Hierarchy of Consequences, increasing our PBIS data. Student attendance incentives through PBIS will support increased student attendance across campus.

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.

According to the annual Florida Tier 1 PBIS Walkthrough, Rainbow's PBIS rating was 87% for the 2024-2025 school year. Our goal is to increase this 5% (87% to 92%) for the 2025-2026 school year.

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 surveys and safety survey data will be monitored. Ensuring the students and staff are aware of the PBIS expectations through PBIS quarterly assemblies and monthly committee meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel, Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School Administration Manager; Hannah Starcher, School Counselor

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Consistency with the Hierarchy of Consequences

Person Monitoring:

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel,
Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School
Administration Manager, Hannah Starcher, School
Counselor; Teachers

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

*Behavior Coaching Academy and PBIS initiatives will support building the consistency with the Hierarchy of Consequences. *Consistency with our Hierarchy of Consequences across the school level to increase the number of trusted adults on campus.

Action Step #2

School Safety Training

Person Monitoring:

Kristina Marshall, Principal; Jennifer Fennel,
Assistant Principal; Stacey Miller, School
Administration Manager

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

*Staff will be trained on additional safety measures to provide students a safe learning environment while they are on school grounds. *Staff will be trained on the Hierarchy of Consequences.

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