

Seminole County Public Schools

RED BUG 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 28
- 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

Red Bug Elementary is dedicated to providing the highest level of education to all students while increasing achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement

We believe all students can succeed with BUGS behavior: Be Responsible, Use Respect, Grow Every Day, and Stay Safe. Red Bug Elementary will support the SCPS mission and vision. MISSION: The mission of the Seminole County Public Schools is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. VISION: Seminole County Public Schools will be the premier school district in the State of Florida. The district will be recognized nationally for high standards, academic performance and offering students customized educational pathways 24/7/365.

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

Dr. Teresa Thacker

Teresa_thacker@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Sets the vision, implements the School Improvement Plan through school-based professional learning and monitors progress, cultivates a mindset of focus for the leadership team, Makes sure goals set in

the School Improvement Plan are strategically aligned with district priorities. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals. Oversees all operations of the school, focuses on the culture and climate of the school in order retain teachers.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Lisa Phillips

Lisa_Phillips@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about curriculum, assessment, instruction, and professional learning in order to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Takes responsibility for activating the school improvement plan through school-based professional learning and monitors progress. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Richard Burkett

Richard_Burkett@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager (SAM)

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Tiffany Everson

Tiffany_Everson@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Guidance Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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

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

Dr. Sarah Brevoort

Sarah_Brevoort@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Math Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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

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

Amanda Feroglia

amanda_feroglia@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

ELA Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about the ELA curriculum, ELA assessment, ELA instruction, and ELA professional learning to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses

data to set school goals. Helps set school reading goals, and through effective and purposeful PLC meetings, assists teachers with designing strategies and monitoring progress in reading. Helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

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.

Data from FAST, the 5 Essentials, the Panorama, and the Snapshot Survey, were utilized to determine areas we need to improve upon as a school. Additionally, feedback from the School Advisory Council (SAC) was utilized to finalize the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Prior to the SAC reviewing the plan, it was shared with the school leadership team, teachers, and staff for feedback. The SIP will be posted on Red Bug's website for all stakeholders to access.

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 SIP goals will be monitored throughout the school year by our leadership team and SAC. All stakeholders will also be aware of our SIP goals from the beginning of the year to ensure that we are remaining on track to meet our goals. Our Action Teams (Reading/Social Studies, Math, Science, Writing, PBIS/RP, Hospitality, and Data Notebooks) will use the SIP goals to drive the work completed on a monthly basis.

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	49.3%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)* ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: B 2023-24: B 2022-23: A 2021-22: B 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	73	140	118	110	136	116				693
Absent 10% or more school days	3	21	20	9	16	12				81
One or more suspensions	0	9	2	2	2	0				15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	16	8	9	12	1				47
Course failure in Math	1	21	10	8	8	3				51
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	1	26	28	13	16				84
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	1	10	24	8	20				63
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	19	9	33	0				65
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	6	9	11	0	6				32

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	19	27	23	22	15				107

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	3	4	5	0	1				14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0				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	3	25	22	25	21	27				123
One or more suspensions		3	1			2				6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	6	14	1	2	2				27
Course failure in Math	1	4	12	1		3				21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					17	25				42
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					18	28				46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	4	14	6	30						54
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	4	10	7	10	7					38

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	6	13	15	14	23	26				97

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	3	4	7	1					21
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†
ELA Achievement*	66	68	59	60	66	57	67	61
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	68	71	59	64	69	58	68	62
ELA Learning Gains	55	63	60	52	62	60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52	56	56	41	55	57		
Math Achievement*	64	69	64	60	67	62	60	64
Math Learning Gains	58	65	63	54	64	62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38	47	51	30	43	52		
Science Achievement	64	68	58	68	68	57	73	65
Social Studies Achievement*			92					
Graduation Rate								
Middle School Acceleration								
College and Career Acceleration								
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	69	73	63	44	75	61	54	77

*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)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	59%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	534
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
59%	53%	69%	62%	56%		63%

* 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	37%	Yes	2	
English Language Learners	50%	No		
Asian Students	56%	No		
Black/African American Students	60%	No		
Hispanic Students	55%	No		
Multiracial Students	60%	No		
White Students	62%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	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	66%	68%	55%	52%	64%	58%	38%	64%					69%
Students With Disabilities	23%	21%	47%	44%	34%	55%	45%	26%					
English Language Learners	48%	38%	55%	58%	45%	50%	33%						69%
Asian Students	53%				59%								
Black/African American Students	67%	64%			50%								
Hispanic Students	63%	69%	56%	50%	57%	52%	30%	56%					65%
Multiracial Students	61%	50%	59%		71%	59%							
White Students	70%	74%	53%	47%	72%	63%	48%	69%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	58%	50%	44%	51%	48%	34%	52%					64%

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	60%	64%	52%	41%	60%	54%	30%	68%					44%
Students With Disabilities	25%	17%	46%	48%	29%	26%	20%	42%					
English Language Learners	46%		64%	45%	57%	68%		69%					44%
Asian Students	67%				58%								
Black/African American Students	57%		53%		35%	50%		50%					
Hispanic Students	53%	61%	41%	30%	50%	44%	25%	60%					45%
Multiracial Students	54%		29%		62%	76%							
White Students	67%	73%	63%	56%	71%	60%	17%	77%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	56%	50%	43%	50%	50%	40%	67%					48%

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	67%	68%			60%			73%					54%
Students With Disabilities	43%	48%			36%			47%					
English Language Learners	43%				57%			40%					77%
Asian Students	86%				86%								
Black/African American Students	43%				33%			60%					
Hispanic Students	66%	61%			48%			67%					74%
Multiracial Students	65%	70%			65%								
White Students	70%	73%			71%			80%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	52%			46%			63%					81%

E. Grade Level Data Review – State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested or all tested students scoring the same.

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	67%	69%	-2%	57%	10%
ELA	4	66%	67%	-1%	56%	10%
ELA	5	60%	64%	-4%	56%	4%
Math	3	68%	70%	-2%	63%	5%
Math	4	58%	69%	-11%	62%	-4%
Math	5	29%	46%	-17%	57%	-28%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	63%	66%	-3%	55%	8%

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 data component that showed the most improvement were the achievement percentages of the following subgroups.

White-Math Learning Gain of Low 25, 17%-48%-31 percent gain

Multi-Racial-ELA Learning Gain 29%-59%-30 percent gain

SWD's- Math Learning Gain 26%-55%-29 percent gain

SWD's Math Learning Gain of Low 25, 20%-45%-25 percent gain

Hispanic ELA Learning Gain of Low 25, 30%-50 percent gain

Support Facilitation in the general education classroom

Collaboration between ESE/Gen Ed teachers in ELA and math

Tier 3 Intervention with ELA and math with students in the lowest 25%.

Emphasis on math during tutorial (before school and online).

Lowest Performance

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

Our lowest components were across the board with our Students with Learning Disabilities (SWDs). The other component are our Math Learning Gains in our Low 25%. A contributing factor is a need for stronger collaborative team planning with rigorous instruction and monitoring from the leadership team.

We are in our second year of an ESSA finding with our SWDs at 37%. This is an improvement over last year at 32%. Our SWDs must be at 41% or higher.

Greatest Decline

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

Our greatest decline was in the area of our English Language Learners (ELLs) in Math. A contributing factor is a need for strong collaborative team planning with rigorous instruction and monitoring from the leadership team.

ELLs-Math Learning Gains-68%-50%- 18% decline**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 between Red Bug Elementary and the State are in Math Proficiency of our Lowest 25th Percentile. A contributing factor is the need for strong collaborative teams to include our Support Facilitators, Separate Classroom teachers, Interventionists, coaches, and General Education teachers.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Attendance

Highest Priorities

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

1-SWDs Achievement-Increase Proficiency in ELA from 23% to 62% or higher

2-SWDs Achievement-Increase Proficiency in Math from 34% to 62% or higher

3-Math Achievement-Increase Math Proficiency from 64% to 70% or higher: Increase Proficiency of Low 25% from 38% to 62% or higher

4- ELA Achievement-Increase Proficiency in ELA- from 66% to 70% or higher: Increase Proficiency of Low 25% from 52% to 62% or higher

5-Science Achievement-Increase Proficiency of Science from 64% to 70% or higher to Include SWDs 26% to 62%

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.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

The Students with Disabilities (SWDs) at our school are currently not meeting grade-level expectations or demonstrating proficiency in ELA and Math. It is essential that these students continue to participate in the core curriculum to ensure they are exposed to grade-level content and learning experiences alongside their peers. Collaboration between general education teachers and ESE Support Facilitators is key to aligning instructional strategies and monitoring progress.

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 primary goal is for *all students* to make meaningful learning gains and achieve proficiency in grade-level standards. For our **Students with Disabilities (SWDs)** subgroup, we are targeting a significant increase in proficiency:

- **ELA proficiency:** from **23%** to **62% or higher**
- **Math proficiency:** from **34%** to **62% or higher**

Monitoring

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

Our ESE teachers will closely monitor student's growth on grade level Benchmarks and adjust their instruction based on the student's individual needs. The Leadership Team will utilize the Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor, Benchmark Aligned Instruction, Monitoring for Learning, Student Engagement, and Conditions for Learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Support Facilitators

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:

Elementary ELA - 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). Elementary Math - 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 Levels - ELA - 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. Math- 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

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with collaboration amongst general education and ESE Support Facilitators in both ELA and Math.

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

To ensure high-quality, standards-based instruction that meets the needs of all learners including SWDs, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will be structured to include collaboration among

general education teachers, Support Facilitators, Interventionists, and separate classroom teachers. The leadership team will actively participate in PLC meetings to support instructional planning, and ensure alignment with Florida Benchmarks. Instructional planning will emphasize small group instruction and purposeful center/station rotations. Monitoring will occur through regular leadership team participation in PLCs, classroom walkthroughs, and analysis of student performance data to ensure instructional practices are effectively implemented and adjusted based on student needs.

Action Step #2

PLCs will meet bi-weekly to review data.

Person Monitoring:

Leadership, Support Facilitators, and Gen Ed teachers

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Leadership will meet to collaborate with Support Facilitators, and Gen Ed teachers to analyze academic data for students with disabilities (SWDs). These meetings will focus on identifying trends, monitoring progress toward individual learning gain goals, and determining targeted instructional strategies and interventions. Action steps will be developed based on data findings, and progress will be tracked through ongoing data collection and progress monitoring.

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.

PLCs and professional learning will center on implementing our instructional framework while identifying and sharing best teaching practices. These practices will support Benchmark-aligned, differentiated, and rigorous instruction in both whole group and small group settings, with a focus on increasing student engagement.

To accelerate learning, we will continue to collaborate with teachers and Support Facilitators to strengthen effective instruction of the Math curriculum and enhance student rotations. Our instructional coaches will work closely with teachers to support student accountability during rotations and ensure instructional consistency.

Through this professional learning, teachers will develop a deeper understanding of how to group, pull, and instruct students effectively within Math small groups.

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 make learning gains. For our lowest quartile students, we want to see a 24% increase in proficiency overall and see an increase within each data component of the FAST assessment in Math. We would like to see the following increases:

Math Learning Gains for Low 25%, from 38% to 62%

Math Learning Gains Overall from 58% to 62%

Math Achievement-Increase Math Proficiency from 64% to 70%

Monitoring

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

Monitoring will be reflected through progress monitoring, student created data binders where students take ownership of their learning, and also through the use of student led conferences. We will also have weekly data meetings with teachers to analyze data and make instructional shifts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal and Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned

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

Math PLC and Instructional Focus

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Leadership team will work alongside teachers during PLC's to plan for standards based instruction and ensure that the needs are met of all learners. The expectation for the work in the classrooms will focus on rigorous instruction, deeper understanding of the Benchmarks, small group instruction, minilessons, and targeted intervention. The Leadership Team will utilize the Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor Benchmark Aligned Instruction, Student Engagement, Monitoring for Learning, and Conditions for Learning.

Action Step #2

Data Review Meetings

Person Monitoring:

Leadership, Math Coach, and teachers

By When/Frequency:

Bi-Monthly

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

Analyze FAST, iReady, and Common Assessment data to drive instruction.

Action Step #3

Math Small Group Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Principal and Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Focus small group instruction on student's needs by differentiating instruction. The Leadership Team will utilize the Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor Benchmark Aligned Instruction, Student Engagement, Monitoring for Learning, and Conditions for Learning.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

PLCs and professional learning will focus on implementing the instructional framework, while identifying and sharing best teaching practices. These practices will support Benchmark-aligned, differentiated, and rigorous instruction in both whole group and small group settings.

To accelerate learning, we will continue to collaborate with teachers and Support Facilitators to strengthen effective instruction of the ELA curriculum and optimize student rotations. Instructional coaches will work closely with teachers to support student accountability during rotations and ensure consistency in instructional practices.

Through this professional learning, teachers will gain a deeper understanding of how to group, pull, and instruct students within their small groups to maximize instructional impact.

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 overarching goal is for **all students** to make learning gains and achieve proficiency in grade-level standards. We are especially focused on supporting our **lowest quartile students** and **Students with Disabilities (SWDs)** to ensure equitable academic growth.

Targeted Increases:

- **Lowest Quartile Students (Low 25%)**
 - Increase **Learning Gains** from **52% to 62% or higher**
 - Increase **overall proficiency** by **10%**
 - Increase proficiency in each **FAST ELA data component** by **10%**
- **Overall Student Learning Gains**
 - Increase from **55% to 62% or higher**
- **Students with Disabilities (SWDs)**
 - Increase **ELA proficiency** from **23% to 62% or higher**
- **All Students – ELA Achievement**
 - Increase **ELA proficiency** from **66% to 70% or higher**

Monitoring

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

During grade-level PLCs, ELA will be closely monitored. Teachers will review both formal and informal assessments to evaluate student progress toward Benchmark mastery. ELA small group instruction and student rotations will be observed to ensure rigorous academic engagement and instructional quality.

Students in the lowest quartile will be regularly monitored through Leadership Team meetings, MTSS reviews, and PLC data discussions with teachers. To support this, an electronic data tracking form will

be used campus-wide to document and visualize each student's achievement level.

The Leadership Team will also utilize the Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor key instructional components, including Benchmark-aligned instruction, student engagement, monitoring for learning, and conditions that support effective learning environments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal and Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Elementary ELA - 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:

ELA - 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

Utilizing Best Instructional Practices

Person Monitoring:

Principal and Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

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

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 lessons. The Leadership Team will utilize the Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor Benchmark Aligned Instruction, Student Engagement, Monitoring for Learning, and Conditions for Learning.

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.

As a result of the low proficiency of our students in Science our area of focus is Instructional Practice in Science. Specific instructional practices are benchmark assessments administered and data used to align instruction, Collaborative Planning in PLCs, Differentiation, small group instruction, and student engagement.

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 Students with Disabilities (SWDs) declined in Proficiency from 42%-26%, decline of 16 percent. Our SWDs will increase in Proficiency from 26% to 62% or higher. Overall our Science proficiency will increase from 64% to 70% or higher.

Monitoring

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

We will use Science Benchmarks Assessments to monitor student's proficiency on Science Benchmarks and guide our instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal and Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Benchmark aligned Science labs will be implemented in our STEM classes 3rd-5th grade in addition to hands-on Benchmark aligned instruction in the classroom throughout K-5th grade.

Rationale:**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:****Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Collaboration between STEM teacher, ESE Support Facilitators, and General Education teachers

Person Monitoring:

Principal and Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Our STEM teacher will meet and collaborate with our 3rd-5th teachers as well as our Support Facilitators to design lessons, hands-on Science labs, and hands-on Science experiments. Our STEM teacher will facilitate the lessons and experiments during his STEM class that is on the wheel. He will meet with these students every six days. The Leadership Team will monitor this Action Step by participating in the collaborative conversations and observing in the classroom. The Leadership Team will utilize the Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor Benchmark Aligned Instruction, Student Engagement, Monitoring for Learning, and Conditions for Learning.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Our area of focus is to decrease student absences. 93 of our 787 students were absent 10% or more school days.

Measurable Outcome

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

Our goal will be to decrease our students with 10% or more absences by 50 students.

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.

This will be monitored through MTSS and action plans will be developed for each students who is in need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leadership Team/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:

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

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Daily Attendance Goals

Person Monitoring:

Leadership and Truancy Team

By When/Frequency:

Daily

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

Our school wide goal will be to have 90% of our students present daily. If that is achieved students will receive school wide incentives.

Action Step #2

Perfect Attendance

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

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

Each quarter students will be celebrated for having perfect attendance with a Brag Tag.

Area of Focus #2

Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Teacher retention is a nationwide issue and at Red Bug we want to continue to build relationships, make connections and keep teachers year after year.

Based on the Data from the Panorama survey the following areas are rated as Neutral: Collaborative Practices, and Collective Responsibility.

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 24-25 school year 4 teachers left Red Bug Elementary. We hope to decrease that by 2 teachers this year.

We will increase School Climate from 74% to 84%.

We will increase Belonging from 76% to 86%.

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.

Using the Panorama survey and through individual conversations with school teachers and staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leadership Team

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:

We will have Action Team meetings with the different grade levels (K-1, 1-2, 2-3, etc.). PLCs will use the ALDs to teach students at the appropriate levels to provide rigorous instruction while preparing students for the coming grade level. This was an ask based on our survey data to work collaboratively and to connect more professionally.

Rationale:

During discussions of survey results last Spring, teachers and staff requested increased opportunities to meet each other and spend time together to learn each other's talents and strengths to pull from.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Maintain a Positive Culture

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

Daily

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

We are committed to listening to teacher voice, providing meaningful feedback, and supporting both teachers and staff. Our focus is on building camaraderie and fostering strong personal and professional connections across the campus. To monitor progress in these areas, teacher and staff surveys will be regularly reviewed, helping us identify opportunities for growth and celebrate areas of improvement.

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.

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned.

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).

ESE performance data from FAST and iReady are used to progress monitor whether core instruction is meeting the needs of the students. A benchmark of 41% of students being at or above proficiency is used to monitor whether further supports are needed. This data along with the data from district leadership walkthroughs in classrooms are used by assistant superintendents to help school leaders problem solve after the administration of these assessments.

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