

Seminole County Public Schools

KEETH 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)..... 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 Allan F. Keeth Elementary School is to maximize the individual potential of each student by providing a safe, nurturing environment that facilitates love for learning and respect for self and others. Through the utilization of technology and open communication between school, family, and community, we will promote responsible decision making that will prepare students to be productive citizens in a changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement

Keeth Elementary School will be recognized at the district and state level for high standards, academic performance, and offering students customized educational pathways. Keeth will support the SCPS vision that every student will graduate from high school prepared for the future as a lifelong learner and responsible citizen in a democratic society. All of Keeth students will perform at their highest levels. There will be equitable facilities and opportunities for all students. The school's personnel will be highly qualified, diverse, innovative, enthusiastic, energetic, and dedicated to the mission.

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

Carol Lynn Tilley

CarolLynn_Webb@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee the daily operation and activities at the school, including but not limited to campus safety, instruction, school improvement, school culture and climate, and family and community involvement.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Melissa Brown

Melissa_Brown@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assists the principal in overseeing the daily operation and activities at the school, including but not limited to campus safety, instruction, school culture and climate, and family and community involvement.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Rebecca Klump

rebecca_klump@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Certified School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Work with staff, students, and families to support social-emotional well-being, work with the MTSS team to identify attendance and behavior needs, then develop intervention plans based on specific needs. She will also guide the Student Study Team, conduct 504 meetings, coordinate with school social worker and LMHC, conduct risk assessments, and communicate celebrations and concerns with administration. Other duties as assigned.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Ryann Hess-Balzano

ryann_balzano@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supports teachers and other instructional staff with understanding and implementing benchmarks, instructional strategies, and best practices. In addition, the instructional coach will facilitate PLC meetings, and MTSS meetings to determine students' individual needs. Models lessons for various subjects including UFLI and instructional routines. Other duties as assigned.

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

Sean Halerz

Sean_Halerz@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Works with school staff to coordinate and plan events, work with the Winter Springs community and business partners to develop partnership plans, and manages the custodial team. Manages social media for the school, facilitates the Behavior Coaching Academy, PBIS, and organizes technology. Other Duties as assigned.

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.

Keeth Elementary collaborates with staff members, parents, and the community in developing the School Improvement Plan. Input is gathered during; SAC, PTA, Leadership Team, Team Leader, and staff meetings. Additionally, input was collected from the 5Essential, Panorama, and Safety Surveys. Our focus is on safety, academic proficiency and growth, as well as students' social/emotional wellbeing.

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)).

Monitoring for the effective implementation of the SIP will take place during weekly PLC and Leadership Team meetings, Team Leader meetings, as well as during SAC and PTA board meetings. We will monitor data for all students, with a focus on sub-groups, to determine growth towards meeting goals for proficiency and learning gains. Data meetings will be held every other month in the data room to monitor for growth and learning gains, then to plan for next steps.

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	31.2%
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) 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: B 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	80	79	81	83	79	90				492
Absent 10% or more school days	1	7	4	2	3	6				23
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	1				4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	12	11	0	0	2				25
Course failure in Math	0	7	2	1	0	1				11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	2	5	3	1	6				17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	6	7	0	7				20
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	1	7	1						9
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	2	5	1	0					8

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	9	3	0	7				28

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	2	1	0	0	0				3
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		9	7	12	6	14				48
One or more suspensions		1		1	1					3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		7	5	1						13
Course failure in Math		3			1	1				5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				1	3	10				14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					5	7				12
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	4	5						11
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		4	3		3					10

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators		5	3	2	5	5				20

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		4	3	1		1				9
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*	81	68	59	80	66	57	76	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	86	71	59	85	69	58	81	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	71	63	60	67	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63	56	56	50	55	57			
Math Achievement*	79	69	64	75	67	62	74	64	59
Math Learning Gains	69	65	63	75	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49	47	51	55	43	52			
Science Achievement	84	68	58	80	68	57	78	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	73		63		75	61	62	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	73%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	582
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
73%	71%	78%	61%	60%		69%

* 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	54%	No		
English Language Learners	67%	No		
Black/African American Students	55%	No		
Hispanic Students	70%	No		
Multiracial Students	88%	No		
White Students	74%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	68%	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	81%	86%	71%	63%	79%	69%	49%	84%					
Students With Disabilities	49%		67%	58%	54%	67%	60%	23%					
English Language Learners	67%		70%		80%	50%							
Black/African American Students	60%				50%								
Hispanic Students	81%	94%	66%	57%	71%	68%	50%	74%					
Multiracial Students	92%				83%								
White Students	81%	87%	70%	58%	83%	70%	52%	87%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	75%	73%	68%	67%	60%	48%	81%					

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	80%	85%	67%	50%	75%	75%	55%	80%					
Students With Disabilities	33%	63%	38%	29%	29%	42%	45%	25%					
English Language Learners	63%		50%		56%	64%							
Black/African American Students	33%				25%								
Hispanic Students	78%	83%	65%	29%	64%	65%	43%	79%					
Multiracial Students	86%		75%		79%	75%							
White Students	83%	88%	68%	61%	80%	80%	65%	81%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	69%	71%	60%	50%	62%	68%	63%	78%					

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	76%	81%			74%			78%					62%
Students With Disabilities	28%	27%			28%			38%					
English Language Learners	54%				50%								82%
Black/African American Students	42%				42%								
Hispanic Students	76%	78%			70%			77%					
Multiracial Students	63%				65%								
White Students	78%	82%			78%			83%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	63%	74%			61%			65%					

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	83%	69%	14%	57%	26%
ELA	4	75%	67%	8%	56%	19%
ELA	5	82%	64%	18%	56%	26%
Math	3	86%	70%	16%	63%	23%
Math	4	80%	69%	11%	62%	18%
Math	5	52%	46%	6%	57%	-5%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	84%	66%	18%	55%	29%

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?

Keeth's ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% increased by 13 points (50% proficient to 63% proficient). During the 204-2025 school year we changed our ESE services to a support facilitation/ push in model. This provided all students with access to their grade level curriculum. Instead of students being instructed at their academic level, they were provided instruction at their grade level with extra support through small group instructions and scaffolding.

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 lowest performance was in the area of math learning gains for the lowest quartile. Overall Math Learning Gains for the lowest quartile was at 49% , 4th grade was 53% and 5th grade was 44%. This is a loss of 6 points (55% making a learning gain, to 49% making a learning gain). Contributing factors for this decline are lack of small group differentiated instruction and the lack of using manipulatives. In addition, ESE students may have missed grade level instruction as they were being instructed at their academic level and not their grade level in previous years. This had created a gap that has not yet closed.

Greatest Decline

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

While Keeth's math proficiency increased overall (75% proficient to 79% proficient) Keeth's math learning gains had the greatest decline (75% proficient to 69% proficient). Contributing factors for this decline are lack of small group differentiated instruction and the lack of using manipulatives. In addition, ESE students may have missed grade level instruction as they were being instructed at their academic level and not their grade level in previous years. This had created a gap that has not yet closed.

Greatest Gap

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the

factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap in learning was in the area of science proficiency for Students with a Disability compared to overall proficiency. There is a gap in proficiency of 61 points (84% overall proficiency, to 23% proficiency for Students with a Disability). The contributing factors for this gap is lack of science instruction over time. This resulted from SWD students being pulled for direct instruction once they were identified as ESE.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

The area of greatest concern on the Early Warning System is the number of students with 10 or more days absent (29 students, which is 6%,).

Highest Priorities

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

1. Maintain reading learning gains for the lowest 25%..
2. Increase math learning gains for the lowest quartile..
3. Increase science proficiency for SWDs.
4. Decrease the number of students with 10+ absences (29, which is 6%, to 25, which is 4%).

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

The area of focus for the 25-26 school year will be to maintain ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile (25%). This area of focus was identified based on the continuing need to meet FPPI goals for the 25-26 school year. The SCPS Elementary Instructional Priorities will be used to guide this work.

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.

Keeth Elementary will increase learning gains for the Lowest Quartile (25%) by 5 percentage points (63% to 68%)

Monitoring

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

Progress will be monitored by administration through the use of the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walk-Through Tool. This Tool is used when observing a class and has identified "Look-Fors". The data is gathered and then used to identify areas of strengths and areas of need, and to determine next steps to improve instruction. Progress will also be monitored during PLCs, and data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Literacy Coach Balzano, SAM Halerz, and Guidance Counselor Klump

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:

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

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 focused PLC meetings.

Person Monitoring:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Literacy Coach
Balzano, SAM Halerz and Guidance Counselor
Klump

By When/Frequency:

Every 6 weeks through May 2026

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

Every 6 weeks, PLC data meetings will be held with grade level teams for ELA. Starting at the beginning of the year, teachers will identify students in the lowest quartile for ELA. They will then use the FAST PM 3 scores from the 24-25 school year to determine the number of points needed to make

a learning gain for each of their students. This information will then be used to identify instructional needs such as whole group, small group, UFLI, intervention and/or enrichment. At each meeting, current data will be analyzed to determine next steps.

Action Step #2

UFLI for K-2nd grade teachers

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Literacy Coach BalzanoTBD

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

Kindergarten through 2nd grade teachers will work with the district reading specialist to refine their delivery and implementation of UFLI instruction.

Action Step #3

3rd-5th Grade Small Group Reading Professional Learning Series

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Literacy Coach BalzanoFrequency: 1/22/2026, 1/28/2026, 2/3/2026

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

3rd-5th grade teachers will participate in professional learning to enhance their techniques for small group instruction. Taylar Wenzel will work with the teams to implement the small group instructional routines.

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.

The area of focus for the 25-26 school year will be to improve math learning gains for the Lowest Quartile (25%). This area of focus was identified because of a decrease from the 23-24 school year. The SCPS Elementary Instructional Priorities will be used to guide this work.

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.

Keeth Elementary's will increase math learning gains for the lowest quartile by 6 percentage points (49% to 62%).

Monitoring

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

Progress will be monitored by administration through the use of the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walk-Through Tool. This Tool is used when observing a class and has identified "Look-Fors". The data is gathered and then used to identify areas of strengths and areas of need, and to determine next steps to improve instruction. Progress will also be monitored during PLCs, and data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Instructional Coach Balzano, SAM Halerz

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

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

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Teachers will deliver small group instruction a minimum of 3days per week.

Person Monitoring:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Instructional Coach Balzano

By When/Frequency:

First semester TBD

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

Teachers will participate in professional development to gain understanding of how to incorporate small groups into instructional time. District math support will be invited to share best practices for

implementation. Teachers will then provide small group instruction a minimum of 3 days per week.

Action Step #2

FACTastic Math Strategy System

Person Monitoring:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Instructional Coach
Balzano

By When/Frequency:

20 weeks

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

3rd-5th grade math teachers will participate in a Factastic refresher PLC, then implement in their classrooms.

Action Step #3

During PLC, identify learning gains needed to meet FPPI goals.

Person Monitoring:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Instructional Coach
Balzano, SAM Halerz

By When/Frequency:

1st Quarter

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

During PLC meetings in August/September, teachers will meet in the new data room to receive information about students identified in the lowest quartile, along with students in an identified sub-group. This will include their 2024–2025 PM3 scores, the learning gains required for the current year, and the specific number of points needed to meet growth targets. Students progress will be monitored every six weeks through dedicated data PLC meetings and reviewed during Leadership Team meetings throughout the school year.

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.

The area of focus for science will be to increase achievement on the statewide science assessment for Students with a Disability as compared to all 5th grade students. Based on the 24-25 Statewide Science Assessment, 5th grade students overall were at 84% proficient and SWDs were at 23% proficient. The SCPS Elementary Instructional Priorities will be used to guide this work.

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.

Keeth Elementary will increase SWD proficiency on Statewide Science by 39% from 23% to 62%

Monitoring

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

Progress will be monitored during PLCs for planning and data discussions, and during walk-throughs in the science classrooms. Also, 3rd-5th grade student outcomes on the Science Benchmark Assessments will be monitored for mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, and Instructional Coach Balzano

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:

Best practices will be used, including explicit instruction, engaging students in activities that require them to participate and interact with the material, ensuring that students understand what they are expected to learn, and assessing student to identify areas for additional support,.

Rationale:

McGraw Hill Florida Science includes leveled readers to be used to support students understanding.

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

Leveled science readers within the ELA block

Person Monitoring:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, Instructional Coach Balzano

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing through May 2026

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

Teachers will engage students in using the McGraw Hill Science leveled readers during the ELA small group instructional block across all grade levels.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Student attendance will be a focus area for the 2025-2026 school year. This area was identified as a need based on the number and percent of students during the 2024-2025 school year that had 10 or more absences (32 out of 511 or 6%) The SCPS Elementary Instructional Priorities will be used to guide this work.

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.

Keeth Elementary will decrease by 1% (6% to 5%) the number of students having 10 or more days absent

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.

Attendance will be monitored during MTSS to determine need for interventions and develop plan. Bi-weekly attendance meetings will be held to determine need for family contact.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, SSW Davalos and guidance counselor Klump

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:

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

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Pre-plan attendance training

Person Monitoring:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, SSW Davalos and
guidance counselor Klump

By When/Frequency:

One time during pre-plan

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

During pre-plan, information will be presented and reviewed with staff for the required contact with families of absent students and the follow-up that will take place as needed. Printed guidelines will be shared from the Attendance & Truancy Procedures manual. Information shared will be from the School SBSC Policy Manual-Attendance-5000-Students- po5200.

Action Step #2

Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Principal Tilley, AP Brown, SSW Davalos and
guidance counselor Klump

By When/Frequency:

ongoing through May 2026

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

Attendance will be monitored through bi-weekly truancy meetings and through MTSS meetings.

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