

Seminole County Public Schools

WEKIVA 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 26

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 29

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 32

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 33

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Wekiva works as a team to promote a safe and positive learning environment for all.

Provide the school's vision statement

Wekiva is a special place where teachers, staff, and students can laugh, grow, and learn together.

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

Keaton Schreiner

keaton_schreiner@scps.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Lead the team by creating agendas and facilitate dialogue focused on student achievement and safety through scheduled and consistent weekly meetings. Conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs, providing feedback on teacher instruction.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Mallory Garrett

harrismz2@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Compile, analyze and disaggregate student data and update through Google Document. Conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs, providing feedback on teacher instruction.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Alex Shannon

alex_shannon@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Instructional/Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Facilitate and manage MTSS meetings. Organize and facilitate PLC/PD meetings for READING related content/updates. Facilitate and teach LQ groups.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Julie Gabrovic

julie_gabrovic@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Science Teacher/Math Coach/NEST Lead

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Organize and facilitate PLC/PD meetings for MATH and SCIENCE related content/updates. Serve as NEST lead teacher.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Jakara Green

greenja@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager (SAM)

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Manage facilities and non-instructional staff. Serve as primary discipline designee. Handle all school management unrelated to instructional practice.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Melanie Bingham

binghamc@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Guidance Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist with MTSS meetings by monitoring Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Schedule facilitate, lead and organize Student Study Team (SST) meetings weekly.

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.

Parents and the community are key stakeholders in the review of our annual plan to improve. Our PTA and SAC are involved in the process of parent and community input in the way of monthly meetings year round. As we develop our School Improvement Plan annually, I make it a point to address the SIP and seek their input and validate our current focus on goals and the direction our school desires to improve upon. Our 5 Essentials and Panorama survey results are also reflected on as we use the feedback to shape the supportive environment.

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 leadership team meets weekly on Monday mornings to examine SIP goals and measure real-time data and the trends with overall grade level/subject areas. We determine action steps that are proven to be successful and what action steps need to be adjusted or replaced in an effort to meet our goals.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	38.3%
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	97	128	99	127	135	122				708
Absent 10% or more school days	4	14	3	10	12	12				55
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	3	3	4				13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	15	11	5	2	2				37
Course failure in Math	1	14	14	5	3	4				41
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	4	16	20	7	20				67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	3	16	28	6	15				68
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	10	7	19	0				39
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	3	6	7	0	9				25

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	15	20	22	9	17				84

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	2	4	1	2	1	0				10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	1	12	19	23	13	19				87
One or more suspensions	1		3	1	2	3				10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	6	9	4		1				22
Course failure in Math	2	5	5	4	1	5				22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					11	28				39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					14	21				35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	2	15	11	25						53
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	1	11	11	13	10					46

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	2	16	9	15	17	24				83

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	3	1	2	1						7
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*	71	68	59	69	66	57	66	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	83	71	59	73	69	58	67	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	60	63	60	59	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56	56	56	47	55	57			
Math Achievement*	68	69	64	72	67	62	73	64	59
Math Learning Gains	61	65	63	68	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46	47	51	41	43	52			
Science Achievement	71	68	58	73	68	57	80	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	87	73	63	77	75	61	61	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	67%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	603
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
67%	64%	72%	69%	68%		75%

* 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	46%	No		
English Language Learners	65%	No		
Asian Students	85%	No		
Black/African American Students	47%	No		
Hispanic Students	61%	No		
Multiracial Students	73%	No		
White Students	66%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	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	71%	83%	60%	56%	68%	61%	46%	71%					87%
Students With Disabilities	39%	57%	56%	65%	36%	40%	38%	33%					
English Language Learners	59%		47%		64%	67%							87%
Asian Students	82%				88%								
Black/African American Students	43%		72%	75%	35%	33%	25%						
Hispanic Students	61%	81%	51%	43%	65%	60%	60%	66%					
Multiracial Students	95%		50%		74%	71%							
White Students	75%	83%	62%	55%	71%	65%	45%	75%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	79%	49%	51%	51%	46%	40%	54%					83%

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	69%	73%	59%	47%	72%	68%	41%	73%					77%
Students With Disabilities	31%	44%	39%	36%	41%	54%	30%	27%					
English Language Learners	64%				82%								77%
Asian Students	77%		91%		77%	91%							
Black/African American Students	36%		28%		33%	76%	83%	40%					
Hispanic Students	63%	67%	56%	45%	71%	57%	26%	74%					73%
Multiracial Students	80%		62%		80%	77%							
White Students	73%	76%	61%	51%	76%	70%	29%	76%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	53%	51%	41%	59%	59%	38%	52%					80%

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.
All Students	66%	67%			73%			80%		
Students With Disabilities	22%	21%			37%			15%		
English Language Learners	44%				63%					
Asian Students	65%				82%					
Black/African American Students	53%				24%					
Hispanic Students	67%	64%			71%			83%		82%
Multiracial Students	68%				84%					
White Students	66%	69%			75%			78%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	42%			57%			74%		

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	69%	67%	2%	56%	13%
ELA	5	60%	64%	-4%	56%	4%
Math	3	75%	70%	5%	63%	12%
Math	4	66%	69%	-3%	62%	4%
Math	5	33%	46%	-13%	57%	-24%
Math	6	99%	71%	28%	60%	39%
Science	5	69%	66%	3%	55%	14%

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?

3rd Grade ELA increased 11% points this school year (72% to 83%). New actions included strategic intervention and focus on standards mastery.

Lowest Performance

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our 5th Grade Math Achievement (33%). This is a -15% decline (48% to 33%).

Instructional Gaps: Inconsistent use of systematic, scaffolded instruction may have left students without a strong foundation in key math concepts.

Limited Intervention: If targeted small-group interventions weren't implemented consistently, struggling students may not have received the support needed to catch up.

Curriculum Misalignment: A mismatch between classroom instruction and FAST item types or rigor may have caused students to underperform despite effort.

Greatest Decline

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline was our 5th Grade Math Learning Gains (64%). This is a -13% decline (77% to 64%).

Statewide Gains in Lower Grades: Across Florida, the strongest math gains in 2025 were seen in Grades 3–4, while Grade 5 gains lagged behind.

Progress Monitoring Impact: The FAST system's three-times-a-year testing model is helping identify gaps earlier, but PM1 and PM2 scores often show students below grade level until PM3.

Learning Gains Subcategories: Students who remained in Level 1 or 2 but moved up within subcategories (e.g., from "Low Level 1" to "High Level 1") were still counted as making gains—but this nuance may not be reflected in broader achievement metrics.

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.

3rd Grade ELA proficiency is at 81% which is 24% points above the state average (57%). New actions included strategic intervention and focus on standards mastery.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

A level of concern for the 2025-2026 school year is that of student attendance. This includes tardies.

Highest Priorities

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

1. 5th Grade ELA Achievement (increase to 70% or higher from 61%)
2. 5th Grade Math Achievement (increase to 54% or higher from 33%)
3. 5th Grade Math Learning Gains (increase to 70% or higher from 64%)

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 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.

Our area of focus is strengthening **collaborative planning among 5th grade math teachers** to improve **student achievement** and **learning gains** on the FAST assessment. This initiative centers on structured, data-driven planning sessions where teachers co-design lesson implementation, analyze student work, and align instruction to grade-level standards and FAST item types.

Collaborative planning includes:

- Weekly Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings
- Implementing SCPS District Framework and formative assessments
- Shared analysis of FAST progress monitoring data
- Co-reflection on instructional strategies and student misconceptions

Impact on Student Learning: Collaborative planning directly enhances student learning by:

- Ensuring **instructional consistency** across classrooms
- Promoting **targeted interventions** based on shared data insights
- Increasing **teacher efficacy** through peer support and shared expertise
- Aligning instruction more closely with FAST rigor and format
- Reducing instructional gaps and improving **conceptual clarity** for students

Rationale Based on Prior Year Data This area was identified as a **critical need** due to:

- A **15% decline in 5th grade math achievement**
- A **13% drop in learning gains**, indicating that students were not progressing as expected
- Item-level FAST data revealed **inconsistent mastery** of key standards and widespread misconceptions
- Informal observations showed **variability in instructional approaches** and pacing across classrooms

These trends suggest that isolated planning and lack of instructional alignment contributed to uneven student outcomes. By prioritizing collaborative planning, we aim to build a unified instructional approach that supports all learners and accelerates growth.

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.

Objective Measurable Outcome - By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, the school will achieve the following:

- **Increase 5th Grade Math Achievement by at least 21 percentage points (54% or higher)**
- **Improve 5th Grade Math Learning Gains by at least 6 percentage points (70% or higher)**

These outcomes will be tracked using:

- FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 scores
- Subgroup performance data (e.g., ESE, ELL, and economically disadvantaged students)
- Item-level analysis to monitor mastery of B.E.S.T. standards

Monitoring

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

Impact Monitoring

FAST Progress Monitoring Data

- PM1, PM2, and PM3 scores tracked for achievement and growth trends
- Disaggregated by subgroup (ESE, ELL, ED) to ensure equity

Exit Ticket & Formative Assessment Analysis

- Weekly review of student performance on targeted math skills
- Used to adjust pacing and reteach concepts collaboratively

Student Work Protocols

- Monthly PLC sessions dedicated to analyzing student work for misconceptions and mastery
- Helps refine instructional strategies and intervention plans

Walkthroughs & Observations

- Admin and coaches conduct biweekly classroom walkthroughs using SCPS INSTRUCTIONAL PRIORITIES specifically in the area of Benchmark-Aligned Instruction.
- Focus on instructional consistency, engagement, and use of collaboratively planned materials

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Keaton Schreiner

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Data Analysis

Person Monitoring:

Keaton Schreiner

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

As our grade level PLC and leadership teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure student progress by analyzing the results of FAST, unit and mid-unit assessments in Math and topic assessments in Math. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or intervention. Our school-wide intervention time will occur daily, allowing for all instructional staff to be available for small group skill based instruction for all grade level learners.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as

a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

The focus is on improving **English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency** for 5th grade students, specifically addressing the **10-point drop from 71% to 61%** on the FAST assessment. This initiative will target reading comprehension, vocabulary development, and writing skills aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards, using collaborative planning and evidence-based literacy practices. This area was identified as a **critical need** due to:

- A **decline from 71% to 61% proficiency**, signaling a significant drop in mastery
- FAST item-level data showing **low performance in text-based writing and informational text comprehension**
- Subgroup analysis revealing **achievement gaps** among ESE, ELL, and economically disadvantaged students
- Observations of **inconsistent instructional practices** and pacing across classrooms
- Limited use of **evidence-based reading strategies** and collaborative planning

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.

5th Grade ELA Proficiency dropped from **71% to 61%**, reflecting a **10-point decline** on the FAST assessment.

Objective Measurable Outcome By the end of the **2025–2026 school year**, the school will:

- **Increase 5th Grade ELA Proficiency** to **at least 70%**, recovering the prior year's loss and demonstrating a **minimum 9-point gain** on the FAST PM3 assessment.
- **Reduce subgroup achievement gaps** by **at least 5 percentage points**, focusing on ESE, ELL, and economically disadvantaged students.

Progress will be tracked using:

- FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 scores
- Item-level analysis of B.E.S.T. standards
- Subgroup performance reports
- Weekly formative assessments and writing samples

Monitoring

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

To ensure the successful implementation and impact of the **ELA Achievement Area of Focus**, the school will use a layered monitoring system that tracks both instructional fidelity and student progress toward the measurable outcomes.

Lesson Plan Reviews

- Conducted biweekly to ensure inclusion of evidence-based reading and writing strategies.
- Focus on text-based writing, vocabulary integration, and genre-specific instruction.

Instructional Walkthroughs

- Admin and coaches using SCPS INSTRUCTIONAL PRIORITIES specifically in the area of Benchmark-Aligned Instruction.
- Focus on engagement, use of FAST-aligned materials, and differentiation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Keaton Schreiner

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence) FastForward (promising evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence). For students with disabilities who are served in separate classroom environments for the majority of the instructional day, additional curriculum has been included to address reading deficits as needed: Reading Mastery (promising evidence) and Corrective Reading (strong evidence). English Language Learners may also utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy (promising evidence) and Imagine Learning Espanol (promising evidence).

Rationale:

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum. All of the listed interventions have been included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Data Analysis

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

Keaton Schreiner

Weekly

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

As our grade level PLC and leadership teams positively work together weekly towards effective instruction, we will measure student progress by analyzing the results of FAST, unit and mid-unit assessments in ELA and topic assessments in ELA. The team will look for trends in the results of these assessments to navigate next steps in instruction, reteaching or intervention. Our school-wide intervention time will occur daily, allowing for all instructional staff to be available for small group skill based instruction for all grade level learners.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

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

Science proficiency (5th Grade) is an area of focus for 25-26 school year. The area of focus is improving **science achievement** for 5th grade students, with an emphasis on conceptual understanding, inquiry-based learning, and integration of literacy strategies. Instruction will be aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards and FAST assessment expectations, with collaborative planning used to ensure consistency and rigor across classrooms.

Measurable Outcome

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

- In 2025, **5th Grade Science Proficiency** decreased from **73% to 70%**, reflecting a **3-point decline** on the FAST assessment.

Objective Measurable Outcome By the end of the **2025–2026 school year**, the school will:

- **Increase 5th Grade Science Proficiency to at least 75%**, demonstrating a **minimum 5-point gain** and reversing the prior year's decline.
- **Improve performance in low-performing domains**, especially **Earth/Space Science** and **Scientific Reasoning**, by **at least 10 percentage points** based on item-level FAST analysis.

Monitoring

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

To ensure the successful implementation and impact of the **Science Achievement Area of Focus**,

the school will use a multi-tiered monitoring system that tracks both instructional fidelity and student progress toward the measurable outcomes.

Instructional Walkthroughs

- Admin and coaches using SCPS INSTRUCTIONAL PRIORITIES specifically in the area of Benchmark-Aligned Instruction.
- Focus on use of hands-on investigations, vocabulary integration, and student engagement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Julie Gabrovic

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:

SCPS District Instructional Frameworks (lesson plan/implementation)

Rationale:

To improve science proficiency and meet measurable outcomes on the FAST assessment, teachers will implement multiple evidence-based interventions that integrate literacy, inquiry, and conceptual understanding. These practices are grounded in research and tailored to support diverse learners.

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

Data Analysis

Person Monitoring:

Keaton Schreiner

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

The school will implement a structured science instructional model that integrates literacy strategies and inquiry-based learning to improve 5th grade science achievement on the FAST assessment.

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.

A large number of our students (52) recorded 15 or more absences (excused or unexcused) during the 2024- 2025 school year. This undoubtedly affects the amount of quality instruction students receive.

Measurable Outcome

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

In the 2024-2025 school year, 52 students had 15 or more absences. This includes both excused and unexcused. Our goal for the 2025-2026 school year is to reduce this by 15% and have no more than 44 students with 15 or more absences.

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 School Administration Manager will run a report weekly that determines which students have met specific thresholds from the beginning of the school year to the date of the report. She will then generate truancy letters and follow up via phone call and/or email if attendance continues to decline.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Keaton Schreiner

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:

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

Efforts to curb tardiness, chronic absenteeism, and truancy can address the needs of students and families, mitigating student failure.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Attendance Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Jakara Green

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

The School Administration Manager will run a report weekly that determines which students have met specific thresholds from the beginning of the school year to the date of the report. She will then generate truancy letters and follow up via phone call and/or email if attendance continues to decline.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections

1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00