

Pinellas County Schools

DROPOUT PREVENTION 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..... 7

 D. Early Warning Systems 8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 12

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 13

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 14

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 15

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 16

 E. Grade Level Data Review 19

III. Planning for Improvement..... 21

IV. Positive Learning Environment 36

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 39

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 42

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 43

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

Educational Alternative Services, through unified community efforts, provides quality educational opportunities and services for students and their families by educating and preparing each student for college, career and life. Educational Alternative Services has schools serving students throughout the county.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% student success

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

Michelle Topping

toppingl@pcsb.org

Position Title

Director, Educational Alternative Services

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Director of Educational Alternative Services leads and supports the district's in-school and out-of-school alternative education programs. The Director oversees the implementation and coordination of these programs and schools, ensuring smooth integration with regular schools and collaboration with external agencies.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Eric McManus

mcmmanuse@pcsb.org

Position Title

Administrator, DJJ

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mr. McManus fosters a culture of rigorous learning, belonging, and engagement for staff, students, and families across the school community. The Administrator leads and supports assigned sites and program school teams to enhance school and student outcomes through continuous training, coaching, feedback, and support. By prioritizing instruction, Mr. McManus effectively balances operational, safety, and policy responsibilities as assigned.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Gayle Palmer

palmerg@pcsb.org

Position Title

ELA/ Reading Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Ms. Palmer is responsible for guiding and directing the Reading learning experiences of students' progress in EAS programs. In addition, Ms. Palmer assists with the Reading professional learning activities with EAS.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Sherilyn Guzell

guzells@pcsb.org

Position Title

Science Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Ms. Guzell is responsible for guiding and directing the Science learning experiences of secondary students' progress in EAS programs. In addition, Ms. Guzell assists with the Science professional

learning activities for EAS.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Kyle Eckman

eckmank@pcsb.org

Position Title

Social Studies Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mr. Eckman is responsible for guiding and directing the learning experiences of students' progress in social sciences courses. In addition, Mr. Eckman assists with the Social Studies professional learning activities for EAS.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Stefanie Graham

grahamst@pcsb.org

Position Title

ELA Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mrs. Graham is responsible for guiding and directing the learning experiences of students' progress in secondary ELA classes. In addition, Mrs. Graham assists with the ELA professional learning activities for EAS.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Wanda Pleasant

meachern-pleasanw@pcsb.org

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mrs. Pleasant spearheads efforts to monitor student data, ensuring students have the pathways and support needed to meet grade-level requirements and transition successfully to the next grade or adulthood. In her instructional role, she guides and directs students' learning experiences in EAS programs. Additionally, Mrs. Pleasant leads the student support professional learning community for EAS and participates in district student support meetings.

Leadership Team Member #8**Employee's Name****Position Title****Job Duties and Responsibilities**

No Answer Entered

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.

Annually, Pinellas County Schools and the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) surveys students, parents, and staff. The District and School maintain a website. Three times a year Educational Alternative Services meets with community partners to address needs and discuss progress.

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 goals (areas of focus) will be reviewed and monitored monthly and at mid-year. Data will be collected through walkthroughs to monitor new systems for blended learning, progress monitoring assessments and attendance. Goals will be revised (adjusted) to address any needed action steps revealed during monthly reviews and the mid-year summary.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	COMBINATION PK-12
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	58.7%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	YES
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	CSI
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)* WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)* ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)*
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT RATING HISTORY	2024-25: COMMENDABLE 2023-24: COMMENDABLE 2022-23: 2021-22: COMMENDABLE 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					22	0	0	3	2	27
Absent 10% or more school days					9	0	0	2	2	13
One or more suspensions					0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)					0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math					1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					4	0	0	1	4	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					3	0	0	1	0	4
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
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

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					5	0	0	3	1	9

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	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times					0	0	0	0	5	5

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							4	5	1	10
One or more suspensions							2			2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							1			1
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							1	3	2	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							2	4	1	7
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
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							3	4		7

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	5	1	10
Students retained two or more times						6	3	2	4	15

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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
	9	10	11	12	
School Enrollment	7	9	19	77	112
Absent 10% or more school days	7	8	17	43	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	18	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Algebra assessment	4	0	1	10	15

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
	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	0	2	17	23

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
	9	10	11	12	
Absent 10% or more school days					0
One or more suspensions					0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)					0
Course failure in Math					0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					0
Level 1 on statewide Algebra assessment					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
	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators					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
	9	10	11	12	
Retained students: current year					0
Students retained two or more times					0

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*	14	62	61	16	59	58	9	55	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement		68	62		64	59		63	56
ELA Learning Gains	18	59	61	26	60	59			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile		52	55		53	54			
Math Achievement*	6	66	62	6	62	59	4	61	55
Math Learning Gains	15	63	60	19	59	61			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile		55	53		51	56			
Science Achievement	11	59	57	6	54	54	6	52	52
Social Studies Achievement*		72	74		71	72	40	69	68
Graduation Rate	3	40	72	1	31	71	1	44	74
Middle School Acceleration		83	75		74	71		69	70
College and Career Acceleration		19	56		20	54		17	53
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)		59	61		53	59	0	56	55

*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)	CSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	11%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	67
Total Components for the FPPI	6
Percent Tested	84%
Graduation Rate	3%

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
11%	12%	12%	7%	8%		2%

* 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	3%	Yes	6	6
English Language Learners	9%	Yes	4	4
Black/African American Students	3%	Yes	6	6
Hispanic Students	5%	Yes	6	6
White Students	6%	Yes	6	6
Economically Disadvantaged Students	8%	Yes	6	6

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	14%		18%		6%	15%		11%			3%		
Students With Disabilities	0%		9%		0%	9%		0%			0%		
English Language Learners											9%		
Black/African American Students	0%		5%		0%	6%		5%			0%		
Hispanic Students											5%		
White Students											6%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	8%		8%		0%	30%		0%			2%		

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	16%		26%		6%	19%		6%			1%		
Students With Disabilities	9%				8%						0%		
English Language Learners											0%		
Black/African American Students	10%		23%		4%	9%		0%			0%		
Hispanic Students											0%		
White Students	40%				20%						1%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	29%				15%			0%			1%		

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	9%				4%			6%	40%		1%		0%
Students With Disabilities	0%				0%			9%			3%		
English Language Learners											0%		
Black/African American Students	0%				0%			0%			0%		
Hispanic Students											3%		
White Students	17%				14%			17%			1%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	9%				6%			0%			1%		

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	10	63%	59%	4%	58%	5%
ELA	5	4%	61%	-57%	56%	-52%
Math	5	4%	65%	-61%	57%	-53%
Science	5	4%	67%	-63%	55%	-51%
ELA	6	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
ELA	7	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
ELA	8	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
ELA	9	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Math	6	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Math	7	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Math	8	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Science	8	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Biology		* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Algebra		* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Geometry		* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
History		* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
2024-25 WINTER						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Algebra		* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				

2024-25 FALL						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Algebra		* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Geometry		* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Most Improvement

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most notable improvement was science proficiency. The percentage of students achieving at level 3 or above rose from 6% (in the previous year) to 11%. This improvement can be attributed to several targeted actions taken by the school:

- The assignment of a dedicated and consistent science teacher provided students with stability, clearer expectations, and stronger relationships—all of which positively influenced engagement and achievement.
- With a steady presence in the classroom, the teacher was better equipped to identify struggling students and implement timely interventions or differentiated instruction.
- Familiarity with the teacher and continuity of the schedule may have helped foster a learning environment where students felt more confident asking questions and participating in science activities.

Although the jump from 6% to 11% may seem modest, it reflects a promising upward trend that could gain momentum with continued support. Consistency in staffing appears to have led to greater content retention and reduced knowledge gaps from year to year.

Lowest Performance

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

Math continues to represent the lowest-performing data component for our school, with only 6% of students achieving proficiency—a rate that has remained stagnant over the past two years. This score falls far below both the state average of 59% and the district average of 62%, indicating a deep and persistent gap in student achievement.

The decline was most pronounced among key subgroups, each of which fell to 0% proficiency:

- Students with Disabilities: fell from 8% to 0%
- Black/African American Students: dropped from 4% to 0%
- Economically Disadvantaged Students: declined from 15% to 0%

Several interconnected factors may have contributed to this continued underperformance:

- Instructional content may not have been aligned closely with state standards or assessment frameworks, leaving students underprepared.
- Students in critical subgroups likely needed customized support structures that were not in place or adequately resourced.
- If students entered the grade level with math skill gaps already in place, current instruction may not have successfully bridged them.
- Low proficiency can reinforce negative perceptions of math and reduce student motivation to persist through challenging material.

Greatest Decline

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

The data component that demonstrated the greatest decline from the previous year was English/ Language Arts (ELA) proficiency. Although the overall proficiency dropped slightly from 16% to 14%, the decreases in proficiency were more dramatic across student subgroups:

- Students with Disabilities: fell from 9% to 0%
- Black/African American Students: dropped from 10% to 0%
- Economically Disadvantaged Students: declined from 29% to 8%

The most prominent factor behind this decline was the loss of a dedicated reading specialist due to staffing reductions. This change likely disrupted support systems crucial to literacy development in these subgroups. Additional contributing issues include:

- Reduced Targeted Intervention: Without a reading specialist, students may have received less individualized support to close learning gaps.
- Limited Differentiation: Instruction may have lacked strategies tailored to the diverse needs of these learners, especially those requiring remedial reading support.
- Lower Student Engagement: Specialized reading instruction often helps foster motivation and confidence. Its absence may have contributed to decreased participation and effort.

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 data component with the most significant gap when compared to the state average is math

proficiency. While the state reports a 59% proficiency rate, our school's score stands at only 6%, highlighting a 53-point gap. Several factors may have contributed to this gap:

- There may be misalignment between the curriculum delivered at our school and the standards assessed on state exams, leading to ineffective coverage of key concepts.
- A lack of targeted instructional strategies could limit student comprehension and engagement.
- Students may not have adequate access to supplemental academic supports such as tutoring or enrichment programs typically available at traditional schools.
- Socioeconomic challenges including economic instability, food insecurity, and limited parental support can influence academic success.
- Missed instructional time due to high absentee rates can severely impact math learning, which often requires consistent, cumulative practice.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Although no EWS indicators were pre-populated for the 2024–2025 school year, a review of student achievement data reveals potential areas of concern that warrant close attention moving forward.

The most pressing indicators of concern lie within the declines in academic performance among key subgroups across Math and ELA:

- Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Black/African American Students experienced a complete drop to 0% proficiency in both subjects.
- Economically Disadvantaged Students declined from 29% to 8% in ELA and from 15% to 0% in Math.

These subgroup trends could signal elevated academic risk, even without formal EWS flags. The consistency of decline indicates emerging patterns that may affect future graduation and promotion rates.

Highest Priorities

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

- Reverse declines in overall ELA performance and recover proficiency losses among all subgroups through targeted instruction.
- Increase math scores with interventions focused on standards alignment, remediation, and engagement strategies.
- Promote consistent and engaging science instruction across all grades by supporting inquiry-

based teaching, aligning content with standards, and encouraging exploration and critical thinking.

- Reinforce Social Studies instruction through coherent curriculum planning, literacy integration, and strategies that boost engagement and content comprehension.
- Strengthen wraparound services and academic interventions implementing systematic support for struggling students across subjects.

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 required by RAISE (specific questions)

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.

Description: Improve teacher implementation of standards-based ELA instruction focused on comprehension strategies, vocabulary development, and differentiated small group instruction.

Rationale: The drop from 16% to 14% proficiency in ELA highlights a critical need to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction and targeted interventions. Data from benchmark assessments and classroom walkthroughs indicate inconsistent use of explicit reading strategies and insufficient differentiated support for struggling readers.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We do not have K-2 students in our programs.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Ensure whole group and small group instruction during the ELA block is designed and implemented according to the evidence-based principles, academic discourse and formative assessment with corrective feedback.

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

We do not have K-2 students in our programs.

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

14% of students in 5th grades scored a 3 or above on the 2025 ELA FAST with a goal of 80% for the 2026 ELA FAST

Monitoring

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches during curriculum meetings, SBLT meetings, PLCs, walkthroughs with feedback, and through the analysis of assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Anna Jones, instructor

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:

Academic discourse.

Rationale:

Academic discourse encourages the development of problem-solving skills, expressing ideas clearly, learning how to collaborate, and actively engage in content.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Writing to learn.

Rationale:

Writing to learn deepens student understanding, improves retention, and supports critical thinking across content areas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Differentiation.

Rationale:

Differentiation ensures that instruction meets each student needs by responding to different learning types. This creates the best learning experience possible by differentiating based on content, process, product, or the learning environment as a whole.

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

Small group instruction.

Person Monitoring:

Anna Jones, and Administration

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/monthly

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

1. Classroom teachers will participate in PD and guided PLCs with administration, the ELA coach (5th), and the math/science coaches. 2. All classroom teachers will analyze data during PLCs to develop and plan and differentiate for small group instruction. 3. Administration and coaches will monitor the fidelity of small group instruction in reading and math. 4. Monitoring will occur through involvement by administration and coaches during PD and PLCs, SBLT meetings, walkthroughs, and data analysis.

Action Step #2

Write to Learn

Person Monitoring:

Anna Jones, and Administration

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/monthly

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

1. Classroom teachers will receive PD on effective writing strategies. 2. Incorporate writing to learn strategies to help students deepen their understanding by reflecting, explaining, and reasoning through mathematical and scientific ideas using written language. 3. Classroom teachers will participate in planning with administration/coaches to implement writing strategies into their instruction. 4. Monitoring will occur through involvement by administration and coaches during PD and PLCs and walkthroughs.

Area of Focus #2

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

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

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

Description: Improve teacher implementation of standards-based ELA instruction focused on comprehension strategies, vocabulary development, and differentiated small group instruction.

Rationale: The drop from 53.1% to 51.4% proficiency in ELA highlights a critical need to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction and targeted interventions. Data from benchmark assessments and classroom walkthroughs indicate inconsistent use of explicit reading strategies and insufficient differentiated support for struggling readers.

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.

Increase ELA proficiency in grades 6 through 10 from 51.4% to at least 75% by the end of the academic year.

Improve student performance on district reading benchmarks and progress monitoring tools by 10 percentage points on average.

Ensure 100% of ELA and Reading teachers implement standards-aligned, evidence-based practices weekly, as documented in lesson plans and classroom observations.

Monitoring

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

Monthly data reviews of IXL Diagnostic, progress monitoring, and benchmark assessments.

Monthly instructional walkthroughs focused on fidelity of small group instruction and reading strategy usage.

PLC agendas and logs documenting collaborative analysis of student data and instructional planning.

Student work samples and academic intervention plans evaluated quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

ELA and Reading teachers/Administration

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:

Explicit Instruction in Reading Strategies (e.g., main idea, summarizing, inferencing)

Rationale:

Research shows this builds deeper comprehension and supports struggling readers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Differentiated Small Group Instruction.

Rationale:

Tailored Instruction Based on Data: Small groups are formed using diagnostic and formative assessment data, allowing teachers to match instruction to students' current skill levels. Increased

Practice and Feedback: Smaller group sizes (1–4 for at-risk students) allow for more frequent practice

and immediate teacher feedback, which is essential for mastering foundational reading skills.

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

ELA instructional Refresh

Person Monitoring:

ELA and Reading teachers with Administration

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/Monthly

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

Provide PD on evidence-based reading strategies and planning aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. standards.

Action Step #2

Data-Driven Grouping

Person Monitoring:

ELA and Reading teachers with Administration

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/Monthly

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

Train teachers to analyze formative assessments for creating and adjusting small groups.

Area of Focus #3

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.

Description: Enhance math instruction through consistent use of explicit problem-solving strategies, conceptual modeling, and differentiated supports aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. standards. Emphasize deep mathematical discourse, real-world applications, and scaffolding for abstract reasoning skills.

Rationale: Math proficiency stagnated at 6%, indicating a significant and persistent gap in achievement. Reliance on our learning software platform may be insufficient in preparing students for state assessments, and students lack engagement, and scaffolded support for conceptual understanding. This need is particularly critical in grades 6–9 where foundational skills impact success in algebra and beyond.

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.

Increase math proficiency in Grades 6–12 from 6% to at least 50% by the end of the academic year.

Demonstrate 15 percentage point gains on interim assessments across grade levels.

Ensure 100% of math teachers consistently implement key instructional strategies (e.g., modeling, math discourse, formative grouping), tracked through lesson plan reviews and observation tools.

Monitoring

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

Monthly reviews of curriculum assessments (e.g., i-Ready for middle grades, Algebra/Geometry EOCs, classroom assessments).

Instructional walkthroughs conducted monthly, focusing on strategy fidelity, and student engagement.

Student artifacts (journals, exit slips, work samples) analyzed for evidence of conceptual depth and

Academic Intervention Plan reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Math instructors and Administration.

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:

Explicit and Systematic Instruction

Rationale:

Explicit and systematic instruction is a high-impact strategy that ensures students receive clear, direct teaching of mathematical concepts and procedures. This approach is especially effective for students who struggle with math, as it reduces ambiguity and cognitive overload. Instruction is sequenced from simple to complex, building on prior knowledge. Teachers model problem-solving steps, use think-alouds, and provide guided practice before independent work. Research shows this method improves achievement across all student groups, particularly in secondary math settings. Students in middle and high school often face abstract math concepts (e.g., algebraic reasoning, functions, geometry). Explicit instruction helps them internalize these ideas through structured modeling and practice, laying the foundation for success in advanced math.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Visual Representations and Math Talk

Rationale:

Visual representations (e.g., number lines, strip diagrams, algebra tiles) and structured math discourse help students make sense of abstract concepts and develop problem-solving skills. Students who use accurate visuals are six times more likely to solve problems correctly. Visuals support all learners, especially those with learning disabilities or language barriers. As math becomes more symbolic and abstract, visual tools bridge the gap between concrete understanding and formal notation. Math talk encourages reasoning, justification, and peer learning, which deepens conceptual understanding. Math discourse builds confidence and fosters a classroom culture of inquiry and collaboration.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Schema-Based Problem Solving

Rationale:

Schema-based instruction teaches students to recognize the underlying structure of word problems (e.g., compare, change, total) and apply targeted strategies to solve them. Students taught with schema-based methods show significantly higher accuracy in solving word problems compared to traditional instruction. This approach improves transfer of skills to novel problems and supports algebraic thinking. Schema recognition reduces reliance on ineffective keyword strategies and promotes deeper comprehension. Word problems become more complex in secondary grades, often involving multi-step reasoning and algebraic modeling. Schema-based instruction equips students with cognitive frameworks to tackle these challenges systematically.

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

Math Instructional PD

Person Monitoring:

Math Instructors and administration.

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/monthly

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

Deliver training on explicit teaching strategies, conceptual modeling, and schema-based approaches.

Action Step #2

Formative Data and grouping protocols

Person Monitoring:

Math Instructors and administration.

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/monthly

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

Guide teachers in using formative data to adjust instruction and develop responsive student groupings.

Area of Focus #4

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

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

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

Description: Strengthen science instruction by integrating inquiry-based learning, explicit vocabulary instruction, and data-driven formative assessment practices across Grades 6–12.

Rationale: While proficiency increased from 6% to 11%, the overall achievement remains low. This area was identified as a priority due to the need to sustain and accelerate growth, particularly in middle grades where foundational science literacy is developed.

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.

Increase Science proficiency from 11% to at least 25% by the end of the school year.

Improve student performance on district science benchmarks by 10 percentage points on average.

Ensure science teachers implement inquiry-based strategies and vocabulary routines weekly, documented through lesson plans and walkthroughs.

Monitoring

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

Monthly reviews of formative assessments, benchmark scores, and lab reports.

Biweekly walkthroughs focused on instructional strategy fidelity and student engagement.

PLC logs and coaching reflections reviewed quarterly.

Student artifacts analyzed for evidence of scientific thinking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Science instructors/Administrators.

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:

Inquiry-Based Science Instruction

Rationale:

Inquiry-based learning engages students in the scientific process—asking questions, conducting investigations, analyzing data, and drawing conclusions. It promotes deeper understanding and retention of scientific concepts. Supported by extensive research showing increased achievement and engagement in secondary science. Encourages critical thinking and aligns with Florida B.E.S.T. standards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Explicit Vocabulary Instruction in Science

Rationale:

Science vocabulary is often abstract and domain-specific. Explicit instruction in academic and content vocabulary improves comprehension and performance on assessments. Research shows that vocabulary knowledge is a strong predictor of science achievement. Strategies include graphic organizers, word walls, and morphology-based instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Formative Assessment and Feedback Loops

Rationale:

Frequent formative assessments (e.g., exit slips, quick writes, concept maps) provide real-time data to adjust instruction and support struggling learners. Evidence shows that formative assessment improves student outcomes when paired with timely feedback and supports differentiation and targeted reteaching.

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

Science Strategy PD

Person Monitoring:

Science Instructors and administration.

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/monthly

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

Deliver training on inquiry-based instruction, vocabulary routines, and formative assessment.

Action Step #2

Data driven Planning

Person Monitoring:

Science Instructors and administration.

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/monthly

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

Guide teachers in using formative data to adjust instruction and groupings.

Area of Focus #5

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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.

Description: Strengthen Social Studies instruction by integrating inquiry-based learning, disciplinary literacy, and primary source analysis across Grades 6–12. Emphasize civic reasoning, historical thinking, and evidence-based writing.

Rationale: Although no formal achievement data is available, classroom observations, student work samples, and teacher feedback indicate inconsistent use of high-impact instructional strategies. Students often struggle with analyzing sources, constructing arguments, and applying historical concepts to contemporary issues. This area was identified as a priority to ensure rigorous, standards-aligned instruction and prepare students for civic engagement and postsecondary success.

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.

Social Studies teachers will implement inquiry-based lessons and primary source analysis weekly, documented through lesson plans and walkthroughs.

Student performance on common writing tasks (e.g., DBQs essays) will improve by 10 percentage points on internal rubrics by year-end.

Student engagement in Social Studies classes will increase, measured through quarterly surveys and participation logs.

Monitoring

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

- Monthly instructional walkthroughs focused on strategy use, student engagement, and rigor.
- Quarterly review of student writing samples and formative assessments.
- PLC documentation of collaborative planning, data analysis, and instructional adjustments.
- Student feedback surveys administered each semester to assess engagement and relevance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Social Studies instructors and Administration

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:

Inquiry-Based Instruction

Rationale:

Inquiry-based learning encourages students to explore compelling questions, analyze evidence, and construct arguments. It promotes deeper understanding and aligns with state standards Builds critical thinking and civic reasoning skills and encourages student voice and choice in learning. Inquiry based learning is supported by decades of research in Social Studies pedagogy

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Primary Source Analysis

Rationale:

Using historical documents, maps, and artifacts helps students develop disciplinary literacy and understand multiple perspectives. It improves comprehension and analytical writing as well as supports standards-based instruction and DBQ preparation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Disciplinary Literacy Strategies

Rationale:

Disciplinary literacy involves teaching students to think like historians, geographers, economists, and

political scientists. It enhances reading, writing, and argumentation in Social Studies and aligns with best practices for college and career readiness.

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

Social Studies Strategy PD

Person Monitoring:

Social Studies Instructors and administration.

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/monthly

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

Deliver training on inquiry, primary sources, and disciplinary literacy.

Action Step #2

Common Writing Tasks

Person Monitoring:

Social Studies Instructors and administration.

By When/Frequency:

May 2026/monthly

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

Implement DBQs and CERs across grade levels with shared rubrics.

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.

Attendance has decreased significantly, with ADA dropping by more than 5 percentage points and chronic absenteeism increasing from 74.04% to 95.41%. This data points to barriers that likely go beyond student behavior—potentially involving family challenges, mental health, transportation issues, disengagement, and school culture. Addressing attendance is critical to improving academic performance and student well-being.

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.

By the end of the academic year:

- Increase ADA to at least 75%
- Reduce chronic absenteeism to below 70%

This marks measurable progress while staying realistic and achievable within one year across all grade levels.

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.

Weekly Attendance Monitoring Sheets: Flag students at risk with 5+ absences

Monthly Attendance Data Reviews: Identify trends by grade level, demographics, and special populations

Tiered Support Logs: Document all Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions

Parent Contact Tracker: Record family interactions, referrals, and support follow-ups in Focus

Quarterly SIP Progress Reports: Share updates with stakeholders

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Social Workers assigned to the programs and Administration.

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:

Implement 3-tiered attendance strategies: Tier 1: Schoolwide awareness campaigns, daily greetings, positive reinforcement Tier 2: Mentorship, parent conferences, attendance contracts Tier 3: Intensive wraparound services, counseling, community partnerships PBIS Integration: Normalize routines and celebrate attendance Student Voice & Ownership: Involve students in identifying barriers and building solutions Family-Centered Outreach: Use empathetic language and offer flexible support plans Action Steps: Survey Students and Families: Identify hidden barriers—transportation, trauma, lack of engagement, etc. Launch “Attendance Matters” Campaign: Schoolwide messaging, assemblies, peer recognition Set Tiered Student Goals: Create achievable milestones and celebrate progress Establish Mentorship Circles: Staff-student connection to foster belonging Offer Incentives: Weekly shout-outs, classroom competitions, attendance privileges Monitor & Adjust Quarterly: Track what's working, pivot on interventions, share wins with the community.

Rationale:

Studies from organizations like Attendance Works, Johns Hopkins University, and AIR (American Institutes for Research) show targeted approaches like tiered systems, mentorship, and personalized

outreach can significantly improve attendance. With attendance rates below standard benchmarks, interventions with clear frameworks (like PBIS, Check & Connect, and multi-tiered supports) help schools deploy resources purposefully, reducing trial-and-error and helping teams intervene early. Many evidence-based strategies focus not only on student accountability but on identifying systemic barriers—such as trauma, family instability, or cultural disconnect—which must be addressed to restore a sense of belonging and motivation to attend. Rather than quick fixes, research-backed models encourage continuous monitoring, adaptive supports, and long-term student engagement, leading to more durable improvements.

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

Survey Students and Families

Person Monitoring:

Social Worker

By When/Frequency:

Monthly through May 2026

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

Identify hidden barriers—transportation, trauma, lack of engagement, etc.

Action Step #2

Offer Incentives

Person Monitoring:

Social Worker

By When/Frequency:

Monthly through May 2026

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

Weekly shout-outs, classroom competitions, attendance privileges.

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.

Collaborative Planning Meetings School leaders participate in at least quarterly resource review meetings with district personnel including curriculum, and student services—to evaluate how current resources are addressing our improvement goals. This includes discussions around allocation of personnel, instructional materials, professional development, and wraparound supports.

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).

Positive Behavioral Incentive System (PBIS) *Resource*: Materials for attendance incentives, rewards, and classroom celebrations *Rationale*: Low attendance calls for culture-building strategies that normalize and reward consistent participation *Timeline*: Campaign launch in September; incentive tracking begins October; monthly recognition events.

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