

Seminole County Public Schools

SABAL POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 2

 A. School Mission and Vision 2

 B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP
 Monitoring 2

 C. Demographic Data..... 6

 D. Early Warning Systems 7

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14

 E. Grade Level Data Review 17

III. Planning for Improvement..... 18

IV. Positive Learning Environment 25

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 28

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 31

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 32

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 Sabal Point Elementary School is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. At Sabal Point Elementary, the parents, teachers, and staff in our school community are committed to providing a safe and educational environment while preparing all students to become responsible, life-long learners and leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement

Sabal Point Elementary will provide a learning environment that empowers students to embrace diversity, acquire knowledge independently, become lifelong learners and productive citizens. The staff, parents, and community will work collaboratively to provide a safe, healthy, and nurturing environment which fosters the academic, emotional, social, and physical growth of all students. We will promote lifelong learning and cultivate intellectual curiosity by providing a rigorous, balanced, and engaging curriculum. SPE will equip students with the skills necessary to meet opportunities and challenges with resilience, perseverance, and determination.

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

Shannon Stokes

shannon_stokes@scps.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Overall function of school operations and instructional success of the school.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Melissa Nycz

melissa_nycz@scps.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the Principal in overall function of school operations and instructional success of the school.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Maura Olvey

maura_olvey@scps.us

Position Title

Math Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the Principal in overall function of school operations and instructional success of the school.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Cheryl Darby

cheryl_darby@scps.us

Position Title

ELA Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the Principal in overall function of school operations and instructional success of the school.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Stephanie Geddie

stephanie_geddie@scps.us

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the Principal in overall function of school operations and instructional success of the school.

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

Cornelius Mays

cornelius_mays@scps.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the Principal in overall function of school operations and instructional success of the school.

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.

Sabal Point Elementary reviewed 5 Essentials, Snapshot Survey and Safety Survey feedback from parents, teachers and students. Feedback was disaggregated to determine areas of concern and improvement for inclusion in the SIP. Our SAC reviews the SIP and provides feedback before final SIP approval.

3. SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing academic achievement throughout the year, in particular with our black students. In order to determine if students achieve academic success, Administration will conduct frequent classroom walkthroughs, provide immediate feedback, encourage teachers to participate in weekly PLC's with the Reading Coach and Math Coach, attend weekly MTSS meetings to monitor the academic progress of students, and attend frequent Data Chats to review data and determine interventions and differentiated instructional needs. Administration will schedule and participate in weekly Leadership Team Meetings with the coaches, intervention teachers and support staff to closely monitor unit assessments, iReady lessons and pass rates, FAST scores and percentile ranks and other progress monitoring assessments with an emphasis on our Lowest Quartile students. The goal is for all students to achieve academic success at Sabal Point Elementary

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	35.7%
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	115	145	154	149	173	133	0	0	0	869
Absent 10% or more school days	5	17	16	10	19	11				78
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	1	1	0				9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	18	31	5	7	4				66
Course failure in Math	1	12	19	3	11	5				51
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	2	23	14	9	9				57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	5	9	15	6	6				41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	3	5	2	12	0				22
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	3	3	0	0	1				7

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	12	31	13	12	10				79

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	3	5	3	0	2	0				13
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	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	1	20	15	14	14	23				87
One or more suspensions	1	3	1		2					7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	12	10	5	5	4				39
Course failure in Math	2	10	6	2	3	6				29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				3	10	16				29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				3	6	18				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)		1	1	1						3
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)				1	1					2

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	3	14	5	4	9	15				50

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

The number of students retained:

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

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	84	68	59	76	66	57	71	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	82	71	59	74	69	58	72	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	74	63	60	76	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66	56	56	66	55	57			
Math Achievement*	84	69	64	86	67	62	83	64	59
Math Learning Gains	76	65	63	77	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51	47	51	56	43	52			
Science Achievement	81	68	58	70	68	57	75	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	76	73	63	83	75	61	73	77	59

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPi) than in school grades calculation.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	75%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	674
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
75%	74%	75%	73%	73%		72%

* 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	50%	No		
English Language Learners	75%	No		
Asian Students	86%	No		
Black/African American Students	48%	No		
Hispanic Students	77%	No		
Multiracial Students	70%	No		
White Students	79%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	66%	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	84%	82%	74%	66%	84%	76%	51%	81%					76%
Students With Disabilities	49%	48%	72%	67%	38%	56%	43%	30%					
English Language Learners	81%	82%	65%	60%	81%	82%							76%
Asian Students	94%		80%		81%	90%							
Black/African American Students	47%	33%	53%	40%	55%	59%							
Hispanic Students	84%	83%	74%	71%	83%	77%	64%	83%					72%
Multiracial Students	80%		56%		76%	67%		70%					
White Students	88%	87%	78%	75%	90%	77%	50%	87%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	74%	69%	57%	71%	65%	49%	63%					75%

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	76%	74%	76%	66%	86%	77%	56%	70%		83%
Students With Disabilities	33%	46%	57%	56%	47%	57%	50%	40%		
English Language Learners	62%		83%		76%	67%				83%
Asian Students	82%		80%		88%	60%				
Black/African American Students	50%		50%		60%	71%				
Hispanic Students	72%	65%	76%	68%	81%	75%	61%	73%		80%
Multiracial Students	75%		87%		79%	80%				
White Students	80%	82%	77%	74%	90%	79%	59%	68%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	64%	58%	69%	58%	71%	66%	49%	58%		92%

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	71%	72%			83%			75%					73%
Students With Disabilities	36%	43%			51%			36%					
English Language Learners	62%				85%								73%
Asian Students	92%				100%								
Black/African American Students	29%	17%			60%								
Hispanic Students	68%	76%			78%			66%					
Multiracial Students	81%				86%								
White Students	75%	74%			86%			82%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	58%			70%			58%					

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	81%	69%	12%	57%	24%
ELA	4	84%	67%	17%	56%	28%
ELA	5	84%	64%	20%	56%	28%
Math	3	86%	70%	16%	63%	23%
Math	4	87%	69%	18%	62%	25%
Math	5	63%	46%	17%	57%	6%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	82%	66%	16%	55%	27%

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?

Component: *Science Achievement (All Students)*

Improvement: Increased from **70% (2023–24)** to **81% (2024–25)** — an **+11 percentage point gain**.

New Actions Taken:

- Teachers implemented inquiry-based science instruction and hands-on labs to boost engagement
- PLCs for science teachers and new curriculum adoption aligned with state standards likely played a key role

Lowest Performance

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

Component: *Science Achievement – Students With Disabilities (30% in 2024–25)*

Contributing Factors:

- Persistent instructional gaps and limited access to differentiated, scaffolded science instruction
- Potential shortage of specialized staff or lack of co-teaching models

Trends:

- Performance decreased from **40% in 2023–24** to **30% in 2024–25** — a **-10 point drop**, showing a downward trend that needs urgent intervention

Greatest Decline

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

Component: *Science Achievement – Students With Disabilities*

Decline: From **40%** to **30%** (10 percentage points)

Factors:

- Lack of adapted resources, gaps in science vocabulary for students with IEPs, and limited exposure to grade-level content due to accommodations reducing rigor

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.

Component: *ELA Learning Gains – Black/African American Students*

Performance: 40% in 2024–25 vs. State/All Students average of 74% = **34-point gap**

Factors Contributing to Gap:

- Higher student mobility or chronic absenteeism

Trends:

- The subgroup has historically underperformed (2023–24 score was **50%**) — the gap is *widening*

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Students With Disabilities (SWD):

- Multiple indicators (ELA, Math, Science, Learning Gains) are significantly below average
- SWD Math Achievement dropped from 47% to 38%

Black/African American Students:

- Lowest ELA (47%) and ELA LG (40%) scores, with math at only 55%
- Consistent underperformance across multiple areas

Highest Priorities

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

- **Increase Science Achievement for Students With Disabilities**
- **Close the ELA Learning Gains gap for Black/African American students**
- **Improve ELA and Math Achievement for Students With Disabilities**

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

Area of Focus #1

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Performance in science for students with disabilities decreased from **40% in 2023–24** to **30% in 2024–25** — a **-10 point drop**, showing a downward trend that needs urgent intervention. Increasing Science Achievement for Students With Disabilities will be an area of focus for the 2025-2026 school year.

Measurable Outcome

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

The goal for 2025–26 school year is to increase Science Achievement for Students With Disabilities from 30% to 62% on the state assessment.

Monitoring

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

Implementation Monitoring:

- **Weekly lesson plan reviews** to ensure differentiation and science standard alignment for Students With Disabilities
- **Classroom walkthroughs** and **instructional coaching cycles** (bi-weekly) focused on science instruction strategies, co-teaching practices, and accommodations
- Regular **collaborative planning sessions** between general education and special education teachers to adapt lessons and labs

Impact Monitoring:

- **Formative assessments and common science benchmarks** will be reviewed monthly to

track progress and adjust instruction

- **Progress monitoring through IEP science goal tracking** (quarterly) to ensure alignment with standards and student growth
- **Data chats** with teachers and support staff following each benchmark assessment to revise groupings and interventions

Reporting & Review:

- **MTSS and EWS teams** will meet monthly to review data and flag students who are not on track
- **Quarterly reports** will be provided to school leadership and district support teams to evaluate program impact and guide next steps

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:

Collaborative Planning with Special Education Staff Description: Structured planning time and coaching for general education and special education teachers ensures alignment of instructional strategies, IEP accommodations, and state standards. Grade Levels: Grades 3–5 (foundational science and tested grades) Implementation: Weekly planning sessions led by an instructional coach Integration of formative data to adjust instruction and supports Monitoring: Meeting logs and agenda reviews Instructional coaching notes and IEP alignment checks Improved lesson plan quality and student engagement indicators

Rationale:

Collaborative planning between general education and special education teachers is a critical, research-informed practice that ensures instructional alignment, consistency in implementation of IEP accommodations, and equity in access to grade-level content. When both sets of educators work together intentionally, students with disabilities benefit from lessons that are both rigorous and responsive to their individual learning needs. Research supports that collaborative practices—such as co-planning and co-teaching—improve teacher efficacy, increase instructional coherence, and lead to better academic outcomes for students with disabilities (Friend & Cook, 2013; Murawski & Lochner, 2011). The practice aligns with inclusive education models that emphasize access to general education curricula and collaborative problem-solving. In the context of science achievement, this collaboration ensures that: Scientific vocabulary and inquiry processes are explicitly taught and scaffolded. Accommodations and modifications are consistently applied in labs, assessments, and instruction. Teachers can analyze data together to identify learning gaps and adjust instruction in real-time. This intervention also builds professional capacity among general education teachers, many of whom report limited confidence in adapting science content for diverse learners. Ongoing coaching and collaborative planning can bridge that gap. Overall, this strategy addresses both equity and quality of instruction, making it an essential part of a sustainable school improvement plan for Students With Disabilities.

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

Instructional coaches will conduct monthly data reviews with grade-level teams and ESE staff.

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:

Impact Monitoring: Analyze science benchmark data quarterly for Students With Disabilities. Compare student growth on formative assessments before and after units. Use IEP progress monitoring tools to measure science-specific goal attainment. During the first PLC meeting we will review the District Instructional Priorities and how they should be aligned in planning for instruction.

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.

During the 2024-2025 school year Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile in Math decreased from 56% to 51%. The goal for the 2025-2026 school year is to reverse that downward trend.

Measurable Outcome

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

The goal for 2025–26 School Year is to Increase Math Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile from 51% to 62% on the FAST Math PM3.

Monitoring

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

The leadership team and coaches will participate in PLCs as well as conduct frequent walk-through's

to give teachers feedback and identify trends informally, through iobservation and with the new District Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool. Formative assessments, diagnostic (iReady) and progress monitoring assessments (STAR, FAST), and curriculum based assessments will be reviewed monthly to track progress and adjust instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Shannon Stokes (Principal), Melissa Nycz (Assistant Principal), Maura Olvey (Math Coach)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions will be used to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Ready Florida BEST Math Instruction, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

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

Productive PLC Planning

Person Monitoring:

Shannon Stokes (Principal), Melissa Nycz
(Assistant Principal), Maura Olvey (Math Coach)

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

During the first PLC meeting we will review the District Instructional Priorities and how they should be aligned in planning for instruction. All Math teachers will implement daily small group instruction during Tier 1 Core instruction following the SCPS Instructional Frameworks which provide teachers guidance for small group lessons. PLCs will bring the B.E.S.T. Standards spirals and Achievement Level Descriptors when analyzing data and/or planning for instruction. The ALD's provide clear guidance on what is needed to move up a level within a given standard.

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.

During the 2024-2025 school year Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile in ELA stayed the same at 66% from the previous year. The goal for the 2025-2026 school year is to increase the learning gains in ELA.

Measurable Outcome

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

The goal for 2025–26 school year is to increase ELA learning gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile from 66% to 75% on the state assessment.

Monitoring

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

The leadership team and coaches will participate in PLCs as well as conduct frequent walk-through's to give teachers feedback and identify trends informally, through iobservation and with the new District Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool. Formative assessments, diagnostic (iReady) and progress monitoring assessments (STAR, FAST), and curriculum based assessments will be reviewed monthly to track progress and adjust instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Shannon Stokes (Principal), Melissa Nycz (Assistant Principal), Cheryl Darby (Reading Coach)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence).

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

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

Productive PLC Planning with Teachers, Coaches and Administration

Person Monitoring:

Shannon Stokes (Principal), Melissa Nycz
(Assistant Principal), Cheryl Darby (Reading
Coach)

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

During the first PLC meeting we will review the District Instructional Priorities and how they should be aligned in planning for instruction. All 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. PLCs will bring the B.E.S.T. Standards spirals and Achievement Level Descriptors when analyzing data and/or planning for instruction. The ALD's provide clear guidance on what is needed to move up a level within a given standard.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

The 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. 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.

Melissa - this is a general description of the MTSS process. If your area of focus is Student Attendance/MTSS, then it should include an intro that addresses that. You could add this to the beginning of the paragraph above: "Sabal Point will focus on improving student attendance as a facet of our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for our students."

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.

Sabal Point had 12% of students absent more than 10% during the 2024-2025 school year. Our goal is to reduce the percentage of students absent more than 10% of the time to 8% during 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.

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

MELISSA - How will your leadership team MONITOR the actions you list in your Action section? This should reflect your real monitoring, not a general statement about the MTSS process. That is already what you put in the rationale.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Shannon Stokes (Principal), Melissa Nycz (Assistant Principal), Cornelius Mays (SAM), Stephanie Geddie (School Counselor), Mary Jo Snively (Social Worker)

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

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

MTSS WEEKLY MONITORING

Person Monitoring:

Shannon Stokes (Principal), Melissa Nycz
(Assistant Principal), Cornelius Mays (SAM),
Stephanie Geddie (School Counselor)

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Each week the MTSS team will review attendance data and monitor students with increased absentee rates. The team will maintain open communication with families and utilize district Social Worker and other resources to mitigate further absenteeism. The principal will include attendance data (absences and tardies) in the weekly newsletters to inform parents about the importance of being in school. The teachers will call parents after the student has been absent three consecutive days. The School Administration Manager and Social Worker will call parents to offer support and discuss the importance of attendance.

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.

<https://www.sabalpointelem.org/>

<https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0581>

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)).

<https://www.sabalpointelem.org/>

<https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0581>

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