

Seminole County Public Schools

STENSTROM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 6
 - D. Early Warning Systems 7
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 17
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 18
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 27
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 30
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 33
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 34

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

Through the pursuit of collective excellence, Stenstrom Elementary emphasizes student-centered, collaborative, process-driven learning, ensuring that our students have the knowledge and critical thinking skills required for success in an increasingly STEM-focused global community. Our MicroSociety program ensures student voice and student choice throughout all academic and social areas of their education.

Provide the school's vision statement

Stenstrom Elementary will set the standard for real life learning opportunities by preparing and inspiring generations of learners to meet the challenges of a competitive, increasingly connected global community. Students will be challenged to learn through innovation, collaboration, and projectbased learning within the MicroSociety environment.

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

Robert Vanderloop

vanderrj@myscps.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Sets the vision, implements the School Improvement Plan, cultivates a mindset of focus for the leadership team – prioritizes what is most important and aligns actions accordingly. Provides

leadership for setting school targets and presents evidence to district leadership of the plan for school improvement each year. Makes sure goals set in the School Improvement Plan are strategically aligned with district priorities. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Amanda Specht

spechtal@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Kristen Hodges

kristen_hodges@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Tiffany Roberson

tiffany_roberson@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helps implement the School Improvement Plan, helps make decisions about ELA curriculum, ELA assessment, ELA instruction, and ELA professional learning in order to improve student learning outcomes, helps create a safe, nurturing learning environment for students. Understands school data and uses data to set school goals. Helps set school reading goals, design strategies and monitor progress in reading. Helps monitor progress of the goals in the School Improvement Plan.

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

Christina Calvar

calvarcm@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

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

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.

The School Advisory Committee, which includes parents, teachers, non-instructional personnel, and community members participated in the development of the School Improvement Plan. During a meeting in August, ideas for student improvement were discussed by the committee and added to the

plan. The plan is being shared in both English and Spanish and other languages by request. Comments and survey results from our Snapshot Survey were also reviewed and taken into consideration when developing goals and action steps. The plan includes strategies that will improve student achievement.

3. SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored by the leadership team and the faculty and staff following each progress monitoring testing window. Implementation checks will take place at SAC meetings following each progress monitoring testing window. Revisions will be made as needed.

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	43.6%
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: B 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	73	104	98	120	114	111				620
Absent 10% or more school days	3	11	10	11	15	9				59
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	4	1	7				16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	16	16	8	7	5				52
Course failure in Math	0	9	17	7	7	4				44
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	1	17	14	7	13				52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	1	15	6	5	15				42
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	9	16						28
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	4	11	10	7					32

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	11	19	13	10	14				67

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	1	1	3	2	0				7
Students retained two or more times										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		21	16	20	6	7				70
One or more suspensions			5	1	1	1				8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		7	13	6	2	7				35
Course failure in Math		7	9	4	8	1				29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					7	16				23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					9	21				30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)			4	8						12
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators		6	9	7	10	15				47

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

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year				6						6
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*	73	68	59	74	66	57	68	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	79	71	59	77	69	58	74	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	65	63	60	65	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52	56	56	52	55	57			
Math Achievement*	72	69	64	69	67	62	68	64	59
Math Learning Gains	68	65	63	66	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63	47	51	32	43	52			
Science Achievement	84	68	58	72	68	57	81	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	30	73	63	80	75	61	55	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	65%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	586
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
65%	65%	78%	62%	63%		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	56%	No		
English Language Learners	61%	No		
Asian Students	81%	No		
Black/African American Students	69%	No		
Hispanic Students	61%	No		
Multiracial Students	65%	No		
White Students	74%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	61%	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	73%	79%	65%	52%	72%	68%	63%	84%					30%
Students With Disabilities	45%	54%	55%	45%	50%	71%	73%	53%					
English Language Learners	67%		74%	60%	63%	74%							30%
Asian Students	86%		93%		82%	64%							
Black/African American Students	63%		68%		63%	74%	70%	75%					
Hispanic Students	68%	71%	64%	40%	62%	60%	50%	69%					
Multiracial Students	78%		53%		82%	47%							
White Students	77%	83%	63%	52%	77%	76%	73%	91%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	61%	70%	58%	49%	55%	60%	59%	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	74%	77%	65%	52%	69%	66%	32%	72%					80%
Students With Disabilities	47%	61%	54%	47%	33%	43%	34%	40%					
English Language Learners	48%		76%	80%	52%	48%	27%						80%
Asian Students	94%		91%		89%	64%							
Black/African American Students	52%		52%	50%	35%	43%	25%	40%					
Hispanic Students	65%	71%	53%	47%	62%	62%	35%	63%					
Multiracial Students	74%	70%	73%		85%	73%		70%					
White Students	80%	85%	70%	48%	74%	71%	38%	82%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	60%	62%	59%	55%	53%	52%	29%	51%					

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	68%	74%			68%			81%		
Students With Disabilities	36%	48%			36%			58%		
English Language Learners	33%	45%			43%					
Asian Students	87%				87%					
Black/African American Students	41%				33%			36%		
Hispanic Students	66%	71%			63%			83%		100%
Multiracial Students	74%				82%					
White Students	72%	76%			74%			91%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	64%			54%			72%		100%

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

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

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

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	78%	69%	9%	57%	21%
ELA	4	68%	67%	1%	56%	12%
ELA	5	71%	64%	7%	56%	15%
Math	3	80%	70%	10%	63%	17%
Math	4	64%	69%	-5%	62%	2%
Math	5	57%	46%	11%	57%	0%
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?

The data that showed the most improvement was when students moved up in their achievement in the content areas of ELA, Math and Science. In ELA, 3rd grade reading achievement moved from 77% to 79% proficient. In Math, overall achievement moved from 69% to 72%, learning gains moved from 66% to 68%, and learning gains with our lowest 25% moved from 32% to 63%. In Science (5th grade), achievement moved from 72% to 84%. We created environments for more focused PLCs. This allowed the teachers time as they were asked to refine their practices related to the BEST standards. This was year 3 of BEST implementation, and teachers were finding what works and what needed to be revised. Continuous focus on achievement throughout the year (unit assessments, progress monitoring, standardized testing) allowed us to track progress and determine what standards still need to be taught. We did this specifically for Math and Science. We also incorporated intervention time to specifically address math gaps.

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 lower performance area for Stenstrom was in the learning gains for the lowest 25% (lowest quartile) in ELA. Only 52% of students in the LQ group in ELA showed learning gains. While 52% may not be very low, it is ranked 30th compared to our elementary schools across the county. As we continue to always improve, we recognize our data chats did not go deep enough into using formative data. We also needed to get some of the subgroup data out to our staff faster so they could recognize what students were in the LQ group and intentionally address those needs. We also could have focused our PD to ensure teachers were equip with the tools to reach those in the LQ.

Greatest Decline

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

The greatest decline from the year prior lies within our multiracial subgroup population with a decline of 9 points (74% to 65%), specially in the areas of ELA learning gains -20 points (73% to 53%) and Math learning gains -26 points (73% to 47%)The next subgroup showing the most decline is the

Asian student population with a decline of 4 points (85% to 81%), specifically -8 points in ELA achievement (94% to 86%) and -7 in Math achievement (89% to 82%). The data charts we used this year were very overarching and they did not specifically address the needs of the subgroups mentioned, nor did we specifically discuss those two subgroups in PLCs. This prohibited us from recognizing the decline and targeting these subgroups.

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.

We don't have state average at the time of writing this SIP. Our focus is going to be on the SWD, ELL, multiracial and economically disadvantaged groups because they all may not have the greatest gap, but their data is the lowest performing of all subgroups. Many of our students in those subgroups seemed to struggle with mental health issues, attendance, and social skills that took them away from core instruction and a focus on academic success.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Areas of Concern:

1. Attendance-number of students with EWS.
2. The number of students identified Level 1 in ELA and Math in 5th grade.
3. The 68 students who have 2 or more EWS

Highest Priorities

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year include:

1. Addressing the learning gains of the lowest quartile subgroup through core ELA instruction and interventions.
2. Maintaining the learning gains of the lowest quartile subgroup through core Math instruction and interventions.
3. Addressing student achievement with our SWD subgroup.
4. Addressing student achievement with our ELL/multiracial subgroups.
5. Addressing the ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile subgroup through core ELA instruction and interventions.

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 Benchmark-aligned instruction, ELA, Student Engagement

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 was related to: ELA. This category drives everything we do with our PLCs focused on ELA. We will address the 4 key questions of a PLC (what do we want students to know, how will we know they know it, what do we do when they know it, and what do we do when they don't know it?). This category was selected because our lowest scoring data point is specific to the learning gains within the lowest quartile in the area of 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 measurable outcomes will be specific to students in 4th (3rd into 4th) and 5th (4th into 5th) grade during the 2025-26 school year. We will increase the learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in ELA from 52% to 65% as measured by student achievement on PM3 of the FAST.

Monitoring

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

Teachers and administrators will look at the lowest 30% per grade level in ELA. Instruction will be monitored through the district Instructional Priorities Tool that focuses on: Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, Monitoring for Learning, Student Engagement, and Conditions for Learning. This data will be brought to the grade level PLC meetings to discuss trends, looking for successes and areas of opportunity. Grade level and subject level teams will have common use of unit assessments at the pre and post points and monitor student progress. Based on the assessment in mind, teams will plan small group instruction in ELA daily. Teachers will use the ALD when planning for core instruction in PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

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), Reading Mastery (promising evidence), Corrective Reading (strong evidence).

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Implementing of Pre/Post Unit Assessments in ELA

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level, Pre/Post

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

Grade level teams will work with administration and our instructional coach to review pre unit assessments. Teachers will use the post assessments as created by SCPS. This will be monitored during scheduled Instructional PD PLCs and Data Drive PLCs. Administration has created a schedule for this effort.

Action Step #2

Utilize Achievement Level Descriptors (ALD) in PLC

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level, Pre/Post

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

step:

Grade level teams will work with administration and our instructional coach to incorporate the ALD in PLC discussions. Teachers will use a PLC planning form and data tracking sheets to address students who know and don't know the standard, and scaffold instruction with the use of the ALD. This will be monitored during scheduled Instructional PD PLCs and Data Drive PLCs. Administration has created a schedule for this effort.

Action Step #3

Incorporate the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walk Through Tool

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, per grade level, per content area

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

The SCPS Instructional Priorities Walk Through Tool will be used by administration and reading coach to monitor trends taking place across the grade levels and by content areas. This tool supports learning in four areas: Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, Monitoring for Learning, Student Engagement, and Conditions for Learning. The outcomes of this tool will be discussed during PLCs, both administrative and grade level, and steps will be taking to celebrate successes and improve practices as necessary.

Action Step #4

ELA Small Group Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Daily, per unit of instruction

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

Classroom teachers will build off of what they learned last year and use the above-mentioned data to identify the best use of small group instruction. Classroom teachers will use the SCPS framework resources, classroom specific data, ALD, and best practices for small group instruction to create data-driven small groups during core instruction.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction, Math, Student Engagement**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 was related to: Math. This category drives everything we do with our PLCs focused on Math. We will address the 4 key questions of a PLC (what do we want students to know, how will we know they know it, what do we do when they know it, and what do we do when they don't

know it?). This category was selected because, although we improved, our scoring data specific to the learning gains within the lowest quartile is 63%, and we need to maintain and/or grow within this category.

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 measurable outcomes will be specific to students in 4th (3rd into 4th) and 5th (4th into 5th) grade during the 2025-26 school year. We will increase the learning gains for the lowest quartile of students in Math from 63% to 68% as measured by student achievement on PM3 of the FAST.

Monitoring

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

Teachers and administrators will look at the lowest 30% per grade level in Math. Instruction will be monitored through the district Instructional Priorities Tool that focuses on: Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, Monitoring for Learning, Student Engagement, and Conditions for Learning. This data will be brought to the grade level PLC meetings to discuss trends, looking for successes and areas of opportunity. Grade level and subject level teams will have common use of unit assessments at the pre and post points and monitor student progress. Based on the assessment in mind, teams will plan small group instruction in Math daily. Teachers will use the ALD when planning for core instruction in PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

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: iReady, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale:

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

Implementing of Pre/Post Unit Assessments in Math

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level, Pre/Post

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

Grade level teams will work with administration and our instructional coach to review pre unit assessments. Teachers will use the post assessments as created by SCPS. This will be monitored during scheduled Instructional PD PLCs and Data Drive PLCs. Administration has created a schedule for this effort.

Action Step #2

Utilize Achievement Level Descriptors (ALD) in PLC

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level, Pre/Post

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

Grade level teams will work with administration and our instructional coach to incorporate the ALD in PLC discussions. Teachers will use a PLC planning form and data tracking sheets to address students who know and don't know the standard, and scaffold instruction with the use of the ALD. This will be monitored during scheduled Instructional PD PLCs and Data Drive PLCs. Administration has created a schedule for this effort.

Action Step #3

Incorporate the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walk Through Tool

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, per grade level, per content area

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

The SCPS Instructional Priorities Walk Through Tool will be used by administration and reading coach to monitor trends taking place across the grade levels and by content areas. This tool supports learning in four areas: Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, Monitoring for Learning, Student Engagement, and Conditions for Learning. The outcomes of this tool will be discussed during PLCs, both administrative and grade level, and steps will be taking to celebrate successes and improve practices as necessary.

Action Step #4

Math Small Group Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Bi-Weekly, per unit of instruction

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

Classroom teachers will build off of what they learned last year and use the above-mentioned data to identify the best use of small group instruction. Classroom teachers will use the SCPS framework resources, classroom specific data, ALD, and best practices for small group instruction to create data-driven small groups during core instruction.

Action Step #5

Fact Tactics in Grades 3-5

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

As needed based on student data

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

Classroom teachers will use the above-mentioned data to identify the best use of Fact Tactics starting in October. This program will support student knowledge of core facts in grades 3-5.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction, Science, Student Engagement**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 were related to: Science. This category drives everything we do with our PLCs focused on Science. We will address the 4 key questions of a PLC (what do we want students to know, how will we know they know it, what do we do when they know it, and what do we do when they don't know it?). This category was selected because we have room to grow and maintain within our student performance in this area.

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 measurable outcomes will be specific to students in 5th grade during the 2025-26 school year. We will increase student performance in Science from 84% to 89% as measured by 5th grade student achievement on PM3 of the FAST.

Monitoring

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

Teachers will implement the Science curriculum as outlined in the framework. Teachers will conduct experiments within the Science framework. Instruction will be monitored through the district Instructional Priorities Tool that focuses on: Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, Monitoring for Learning, Student Engagement, and Conditions for Learning. Teachers will have access to district TOA support in the area of Science during PLCs. Teachers will use the ALD when planning for core instruction and data chats in PLCs. Teachers and administration will review the October, February, and April Science benchmark data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

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:

Teachers will utilize the tier 1 Science framework during their core instructional periods.

Rationale:

We will continue to build off of the knowledge of our students and teachers from last year.

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

Implement the SCPS Science curriculum

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany Roberson

By When/Frequency:

Per unit, per grade level.

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

Teachers will implement the SCPS Science curriculum, embed conversations related to Science instruction within their PLCs, and continue to ensure hands on science practices and dedicated Science instruction in our K-5 schedule.

Action Step #2

Incorporate the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walk Through Tool

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop, Amanda Specht, Tiffany

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, per grade level, per content area

Roberson

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

The SCPS Instructional Priorities Walk Through Tool will be used by administration and reading coach to monitor trends taking place across the grade levels and by content areas. This tool supports learning in four areas: Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, Monitoring for Learning, Student Engagement, and Conditions for Learning. The outcomes of this tool will be discussed during PLCs, both administrative and grade level, and steps will be taking to celebrate successes and improve practices as necessary.

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.

As displayed in EdInsight, our data showed roughly 10% of our school population were in school less than 90% of the time. Specifically, for the 2025-26 school year, 12 students will be in 1st grade, 12 students in 2nd grade, 11 students in 3rd grade, 16 students in 4th, and 11 students in 5th grade. This means these students missed at least 10% or more of instruction last school year. Research shows that attendance has an impact on student performance. This percentage is not a high number compared to other schools across the county, but this is our data and each student on this list is unique and is afforded equal opportunities to learn alongside their peers.

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.

We will decrease the percent of students with 15 or more absences by 20% from 15% to 12% as measured by end of year district attendance data.

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.

We will identify the students who are on the attendance list and share those names with grade level teachers, school counselor, social worker, all administration, and other building level staff. We will pull attendance data monthly and share this information with all necessary staff connected to these students. This ongoing monitoring will draw attention to these students and the teachers who have

these students in their classrooms. We will provide support for those students and those teachers to help engage parents and increase attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Robert Vanderloop

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

Preventative Communication Yielding a Focus on Positive School Attendance

Person Monitoring:

Robert Vanderloop

By When/Frequency:

During Leadership/Grade Level PLCs/MTSS:
Monthly

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

1. Attendance data will be pulled monthly for students who are 90% or below. 2. Data will be shared with relevant stakeholders (grade level teachers, school counselor, social worker, all administration, and other building level staff) 3. Parent meetings will be set up as needed 4. Ongoing communication and attendance tips will be shared with all stakeholders (including all families) will be done regularly. Teachers will call/email families when noticing attendance concerns beyond 1 day. We will use our

district promoted communication tool, Parent Square, to engage with our families.

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