Walton County School District

FREEPORT SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL



2026-27 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 11

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 15

E. Grade Level Data Review 18

III. Planning for Improvement 19

IV. Positive Learning Environment 29

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 34

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 37

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 38

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

The Department's SIP template meets:

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Freeport High School is to recognize and encourage the capabilities of the individual student.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Freeport High School is to create a safe student-centered environment that focuses on graduating students who are college and/or career ready and are emotionally prepared to be productive citizens.

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

Edward Farris

edward.farris@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Teacher-SAC Chair

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mr. Farris will serve as the School Improvement Chair. He will be responsible for scheduling meetings, hosting the SAC team meetings, and aid in data collection.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Russell Phillips

russell.phillips@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title
TSA Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

As the assistant principal, Mr. Phillips will help monitor all goals. He will be using the school's social media accounts, the school website, and the school's YouTube channel to increase parent involvement and invite parents to parent nights. His role as assistant principal will also allow him to closely monitor student behavior and work with the MTSS team to make goals and plans for students who are in our early warning system.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Lisbeth Jackson

lisbethjackson@gmail.com

Position Title
SAC Member (Community)

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Phaedra Nunley

Phaedra.Nunley@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title
SAC Member (Parent)

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name
Rebekah Arban

arbanr@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities
No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name
Anne Turner

lisbeth.turner@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title
SAC Member ESP/Parent

Job Duties and Responsibilities
No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name
Jessie Hodge

jessie.hodge@jonsmithsubs.com

Position Title
SAC Member Business Owner

Job Duties and Responsibilities
No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name
Haas Turner

lisabethjackson@gmail.com

Position Title
SAC Member Student

Job Duties and Responsibilities
No Answer Entered

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name
Madysen Farris

nole63ef@yahoo.com

Position Title
SAC Member Student

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.

The School Advisory and School Improvement meetings will continue their meetings. This will allow the SAC committee to see what is discussed during monthly SIP meetings and allow them to give input from a stakeholder standpoint. It will also promote a culture where all stakeholders understand that the school "isn't an isolated building in which learning happens only inside four-walled classrooms, but rather a hub of learning, communication, and information in which everyone has an active, important role" (O'Neal, 2012). Involving stakeholders in the decision-making process makes everyone accountable for the success of Freeport High School.

Freeport High School will collaborate with Freeport Middle and Elementary on a unified community theme of forging futures and growing opportunities.

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)).

Each area of concern has a designated individual to oversee the implementation and effectiveness of the specific area. The plan will be reviewed at SAC meetings for stakeholders to provide feedback.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**SENIOR HIGH** **9-12**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**38.6%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**NO**
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	**N/A**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)** **ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)** **BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)** **HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)** **MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)** **WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)** **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)**
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY **2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.*	**2025-26: A** **2024-25: A** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: A** **2021-22: A**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

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.

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

Current Year (2026-27)

Using 2025-26 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL 9	10	11	12	TOTAL
School Enrollment					0
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

Current Year (2026-27)

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 9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Students with two or more indicators					0

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL 9	10	11	12	TOTAL
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 (2025-26) 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 (2025-26) 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 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	71	68	62	71	68	59	61	63	55
Grade 3 ELA Achievement									
ELA Learning Gains	64	60	59	68	64	58	59	57	57
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61	55	55	53	59	56	56	55	55
Math Achievement*	77	74	52	74	73	49	79	71	45
Math Learning Gains	62	62	45	64	65	47	69	62	47
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76	71	44	58	66	49	64	60	49
Science Achievement	98	87	74	91	90	72	87	86	68
Social Studies Achievement*	89	87	76	90	87	75	91	87	71
Graduation Rate	99	100	94	100	100	92	98	99	90
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration	87	87	74	83	81	69	86	75	67
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					54	52		58	49

*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)

2025-26 ESSA FPPI

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	79%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	785
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	99%

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY

2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
79%	75%	71%	73%	72%	66%	

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 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	63%	No		
English Language Learners	57%	No		
Black/African American Students	70%	No		
Hispanic Students	74%	No		
Multiracial Students	83%	No		
White Students	79%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	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.

2025-26 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 2024-25	C&C ACCEL 2024-25	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	71%		64%	61%	78%	62%	76%	98%	89%		99%	87%	
Students With Disabilities	36%		48%	47%	55%	50%		100%	74%		100%	61%	
English Language Learners	42%		74%	68%	55%	38%			62%				
Black/African American Students	70%												
Hispanic Students	64%		70%	68%	59%	55%		100%	77%		100%	72%	
Multiracial Students	94%		77%		77%								
White Students	71%		62%	58%	82%	64%	74%	98%	90%		100%	91%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%		56%	59%	66%	51%	65%	97%	89%		98%	81%	

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 PROGRES
All Students	71%		68%	53%	76%	64%	58%	91%	90%		100%	83%	70%
Students With Disabilities	45%		50%	38%	48%	47%		75%	86%		100%	58%	
English Language Learners	24%		51%	50%	64%	53%		47%	69%				70%
Hispanic Students	48%		63%	58%	75%	70%		71%	79%		100%	79%	69%
Multiracial Students	83%		55%										
White Students	77%		70%	48%	75%	63%	57%	96%	94%		100%	84%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	64%		67%	60%	72%	62%	59%	83%	85%		100%	78%	67%

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	61%		59%	56%	79%	69%	64%	87%	91%		98%	86%	35%
Students With Disabilities	39%		53%	47%	54%	39%	33%	65%	74%		94%	71%	
English Language Learners	12%		52%	55%	53%			60%					35%
Hispanic Students	42%		67%	58%	62%	56%	54%	78%	84%		96%	74%	35%
White Students	65%		58%	55%	82%	72%	67%	89%	93%		99%	88%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%		63%	66%	76%	70%	73%	81%	85%		98%	82%	25%

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.

		2025-26 SPRING				
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	9	68%	65%	3%	60%	8%
ELA	10	72%	70%	2%	61%	11%
Biology	9	97%	96%	1%	87%	10%
Biology	10	98%	77%	21%	60%	38%
Algebra	9	76%	76%	0%	41%	35%
Algebra	10	47%	59%	-12%	31%	16%
Geometry	9	90%	87%	3%	75%	15%
Geometry	10	80%	74%	6%	40%	40%
Geometry	11	78%	51%	27%	26%	52%
Geometry	12	58%	43%	15%	19%	39%
History	11	89%	85%	4%	75%	14%
Biology	11	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Algebra	11	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Algebra	12	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
History	10	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
History	12	* 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?

Our most improved component was the ELA and Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%. ELA learning gains increased from 37.5% to 46.7% in one year. Math learning gains increased from 58% to 76% in one year. This growth reflects the intentional implementation of targeted ELA and math interventions, AVID instructional strategies, and structured push-in support to increase learning gains in ELA and Algebra I, with a focus on the Lowest Quartile (LQ) and Students with Disabilities (SWD).

Lowest Performance

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

The lowest-performing data component is Algebra 1 with 66% Achievement. Contributing factors included ineffective push-in support that lacked strategic alignment and collaboration, inconsistent implementation of interventions, emphasis on overall proficiency rather than growth, persistent foundational skill deficits, and attendance/engagement challenges. These declines highlight the urgent need for systematic, data-driven intervention models that provide targeted, high-impact support for our most struggling learners.

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 was observed among Learning Gains in both ELA and Math. ELA Learning Gains decreased from 68% in 2025 to 64% in 2026, while Math Learning Gains dropped from 64% to 62%. Contributing factors included ineffective push-in support that lacked strategic alignment and collaboration, inconsistent implementation of interventions, emphasis on overall proficiency rather than growth, persistent foundational skill deficits, and attendance/engagement challenges. These declines highlight the urgent need for systematic, data-driven intervention models that provide targeted, high-impact support for our most struggling learners.

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.

Compared to state averages, we are ahead in major categories but after evaluating our own data we noticed our 3s and 4s decreased in learning gains compared to other groups. Contributing factors include ineffective push-in supports, inconsistent implementation of Tier II and Tier III math interventions, persistent foundational skill gaps, and limited engagement among struggling learners. We will implement targeted ELA and math interventions, AVID instructional strategies, PLC, and structured push-in support to increase learning gains in ELA and Algebra I.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

NA

Highest Priorities

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

Our highest priorities are accelerating growth for the Lowest 25% in both ELA and Math, closing achievement gaps for Students with Disabilities, improving the effectiveness of push-in and intervention supports, stabilizing math achievement, and sustaining ELA growth while addressing subgroup gaps. These priorities target the areas of greatest need to ensure that all students, especially those who are most at risk, experience meaningful academic progress.

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.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Our area of focus is improving ELA and Math outcomes for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades assessed by the FAST ELA, Algebra I EOC, and Geometry EOC. In 2026, only 36% of SWD were proficient in ELA and 54.7% in Math, compared to overall school proficiency of 71.5% and 77.5%. Data also show that 46.7% of SWD in the ELA Lowest 25% demonstrated growth, widening subgroup gaps. This was identified as a crucial need due to persistent underperformance, ineffective push-in supports, and inconsistent intervention practices. By targeting SWD with differentiated instruction, strategic interventions, and improved co-teaching, we aim to close achievement gaps and ensure equitable access to grade-level learning.

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.

69% of students with disabilities will show learning gains as evidenced by FAST ELA PM3. (PM3 to PM3)

77% of students with disabilities will show learning gains as evidenced by Algebra and Geometry EOC. (PM3 to PM3)

Monitoring

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through collaborative data meetings with teachers, math coaches, and administration following STAR assessments and other progress monitoring tools, including FAST and EOC benchmarks. Progress will be reviewed at regular intervals to track SWD

growth in both ELA and Math, with adjustments made to interventions as needed. Implementation will also be monitored through PLC discussions, co-teaching observations, and push-in fidelity checks to ensure strategies are being applied consistently. The impact will be measured by increases in SWD learning gains on FAST ELA, Algebra I, and Geometry assessments, moving toward the 69% and 77% targets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Donna Simmons

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:
Our school will implement collaboration through ESE push-in support and the Unique Skills curriculum model to improve outcomes for Students with Disabilities (SWD). Research supports that inclusive co-teaching and push-in services increase access to grade-level content, improve engagement, and lead to higher achievement for SWD (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010). The Unique Skills curriculum further provides evidence-based instruction in literacy, numeracy, social-emotional, and functional skills, directly addressing IEP goals and building foundational learning for long-term success (Florida Department of Education, BESE, 2022). This focus was identified as a crucial need because 2026 data show that only 36% of SWD were proficient in ELA and 54.7% in Math, far below overall school averages of 71.5% and 77.5%. Monitoring will occur through collaborative data meetings with teachers, ESE staff, math coaches, and administrators using STAR, FAST, and EOC progress monitoring results. In addition, PLC discussions, fidelity checks of push-in implementation, and administrative walkthroughs will ensure interventions are consistently applied and adjusted, with impact measured by SWD learning gains in ELA and Math.

Rationale:
This area was identified as a crucial need because Students with Disabilities (SWD) continue to perform significantly below their peers, with only 36% proficient in ELA and 54.7% proficient in Math compared to overall school averages of 71.5% and 77.5%. In addition, only 46.7% of SWD in the ELA Lowest 25% subgroup demonstrated growth, highlighting that previous supports, including push-in services, were not consistently effective. Targeting this subgroup with evidence-based interventions is essential to close persistent achievement gaps and ensure equitable access to grade-level learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1
Redesign push-in

Person Monitoring:
Donna Simmons

By When/Frequency:
Before school/Pre-planning

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Redesign Push-In Support: Establish a structured push-in model where ESE and general education teachers co-plan lessons weekly to ensure alignment of interventions with grade-level standards.

Action Step #2
Progress Monitoring:

Person Monitoring:
Simmons/Bump

By When/Frequency:
Biweekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Conduct biweekly collaborative data meetings with ESE teachers, general education teachers, math coaches, and administrators to review STAR, FAST, and classroom data, adjusting interventions as needed.

Action Step #3
Professional Development & Fidelity Checks:

Person Monitoring:
Simmons

By When/Frequency:
Planning days/Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Provide targeted PD on evidence-based instructional strategies for SWD and conduct administrative walkthroughs/fidelity checks to ensure push-in and Unique Skills implementation are consistent and effective.

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.

Our school will implement **targeted reading interventions, AVID instructional strategies, and collaborative ELA push-in support** to accelerate learning gains for all students, with a focus on the Lowest Quartile (LQ). Evidence shows that **structured literacy approaches, small-group guided reading, and targeted vocabulary/comprehension strategies improve outcomes for struggling readers** (Foorman et al., 2016). In addition, **AVID strategies such as focused note-taking, Socratic seminars, and organizational supports** provide students with structured approaches to reading, writing, and critical thinking that are transferable across content areas. Collaborative push-in models allow ESE and support staff to reinforce both literacy and AVID practices in the general

education classroom. This focus was identified as a crucial need because, although overall ELA Achievement increased from 71% in 2025 to 71.5% in 2026, only **46.7% of Lowest Quartile students made learning gains**, an increase from 37.5% the prior year. Addressing this gap ensures that improvements benefit all learners equitably.

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.

67% of all students will demonstrate a learning gain on FAST ELA PM3.

69% of Lowest Quartile (LQ) students will demonstrate a learning gain on FAST ELA PM3.

Monitoring

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

This will be monitored through FAST data and K12 Lift data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Donna Simmons

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:

Our school will implement targeted reading interventions, AVID instructional strategies, schoolwide reading practices, and collaborative ELA push-in support to accelerate learning gains for all students, with a focus on the Lowest Quartile (LQ). Evidence shows that structured literacy approaches, small-group guided reading, and targeted vocabulary/comprehension strategies improve outcomes for struggling readers (Foorman et al., 2016). In addition, AVID strategies such as focused note-taking, Socratic seminars, and organizational supports provide students with structured approaches to reading, writing, and critical thinking that are transferable across content areas. Collaborative push-in models allow ESE and support staff to reinforce literacy and AVID practices in the general education classroom.

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1
PLCs and Department Meetings:

Person Monitoring:
Donna Simmons

By When/Frequency:
Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Utilize PLCs and monthly department meetings to review subgroup reading data, share instructional artifacts, and identify adjustments to literacy strategies that will better support LQ and SWD students.

Action Step #2
Schoolwide Reading Implementation:

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Ensure consistent implementation of a schoolwide reading plan, requiring every department to integrate literacy strategies (annotation, content-area vocabulary, AVID note-taking) to reinforce reading skills across all grade levels.

Action Step #3
Data Chats with Teachers and Students:

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Hold collaborative data chats with teachers to adjust instructional practices and one-on-one student data chats to set goals, reflect on progress, and build ownership of learning.

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.

This focus was identified as a crucial need because Math Achievement rose slightly from **74% in 2025 to 77.5% in 2026**, and Math Lowest 25% rose from **58% to 76%**, closing our subgroup gaps. Continuing to strive for gains is essential to continued growth in schoolwide math performance and ensuring equitable growth for all learners.

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.

64% of all Algebra I and Geometry students will demonstrate a learning gain as evidenced by their EOC assessments.

77% of Algebra I and Geometry students in the Lowest Quartile (LQ) will demonstrate a learning gain as evidenced by their EOC assessments.

Monitoring

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

Through EOC and Star Data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Simmons and Miller

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:

Our school will continue implementing targeted math interventions, AVID instructional strategies, and structured push-in support to increase learning gains in Algebra I and Geometry, with a focus on the Lowest Quartile (LQ) and Students with Disabilities (SWD). Research demonstrates that explicit problem-solving instruction, scaffolded practice, and data-driven small-group interventions improve outcomes for struggling math learners (Gersten, Beckmann, Clarke, Foegen, Marsh, Star, & Witzel, 2009). In addition, AVID strategies such as collaborative problem solving, focused note-taking, and organizational tools will be embedded to support student understanding and retention of mathematical concepts.

Rationale:

This goal was identified as a priority because, while overall math performance remains above state averages, schoolwide achievement rose from 74% to 77.5%, and the Math Lowest Quartile subgroup rose from 58% to 76%. By strengthening push-in supports, embedding AVID strategies, monitoring FAST data, conducting teacher and student data chats, and aligning interventions through PLCs, the school will continue to accelerate growth in Algebra I and Geometry and close subgroup achievement gaps.

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
Redesign Math Push-In Support:

Person Monitoring:
Russell Phillips

By When/Frequency:
Preplanning

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Implement structured push-in for LQ and SWD students in Algebra I and Geometry, with ESE and support teachers co-planning with general education teachers to align scaffolds and interventions.

Action Step #2
Progress Monitoring:

Person Monitoring:
Simmons

By When/Frequency:
Biweekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Review FAST math progress monitoring data, STAR data, and classroom assessments biweekly to track student progress in Algebra I and Geometry.

Action Step #3
Data Chats with Teachers and Students:

Person Monitoring:
Simmons/Teachers

By When/Frequency:
Quartley

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Conduct collaborative data chats with teachers to adjust math instruction and student data chats to set growth goals, review progress, and build accountability.

Action Step #4
PLCs and Department Meetings:

Person Monitoring:
Simmons

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Use PLCs and monthly department meetings to review subgroup math data, share instructional artifacts, and identify targeted supports to close gaps for LQ and SWD students in Algebra I and Geometry.

Area of Focus #4

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

Strengthening PLCs is essential for building a culture of collaboration and continuous improvement. By focusing on **data-driven discussions, instructional artifacts, and subgroup performance**, teachers will align practices to schoolwide priorities and accelerate student growth. PLCs serve as the foundation for sustaining improvement in both **academic outcomes and teacher effectiveness**.

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.

100% of teachers will actively participate in their Professional Learning Communities by presenting instructional artifacts and subgroup data quarterly. Monthly department meetings will be structured around data-driven discussions to identify and address areas of need for both student achievement and teacher support.

Monitoring

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

This will be monitored by admin and PLF

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Donna Simmons

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:

Our school will strengthen Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) as a core structure for collaborative, data-driven improvement. Research shows that effective PLCs increase teacher collaboration, improve instructional practices, and lead to measurable gains in student learning outcomes (DuFour, DuFour, & Eaker, 2020; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Teachers will regularly analyze subgroup data, share instructional strategies, and present artifacts to evaluate the impact of classroom practices. This area was identified as a crucial need because while student achievement in several areas has improved, achievement gaps persist among SWD, LQ, and ELL students. Strengthening PLCs ensures that staff collaborate around data and implement evidence-based strategies consistently across classrooms to close those gaps.

Rationale:
Strengthening PLCs is essential for building a culture of collaboration and continuous improvement. By focusing on data-driven discussions, instructional artifacts, and subgroup performance, teachers will align practices to schoolwide priorities and accelerate student growth. PLCs serve as the foundation for sustaining improvement in both academic outcomes and teacher effectiveness.

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
Integration with Schoolwide Priorities

Person Monitoring:
Donna Simmons

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Align PLC discussions with schoolwide goals (SWD, LQ, ELA, and Math) so teachers directly connect their instructional practices to SIP targets.

Action Step #2
Quarterly Data Presentations:

Person Monitoring:
Donna Simmons

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Require teachers to present instructional artifacts (lesson plans, student work, assessments) and subgroup data during PLC meetings each quarter

Action Step #3
Monthly Department Data Meetings:

Person Monitoring:
Donna Simmons

By When/Frequency:
Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Structure department meetings to focus on analyzing FAST, STAR, and EOC data, identifying trends, and determining next instructional steps.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Other: Parent Outreach

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.

Parent involvement is directly linked to student success, particularly in attendance, engagement, and achievement. By targeting parent contact, the school can address high-priority areas such as **testing readiness, support for failing students, and graduation preparation**. The addition of **individual data chats for every family** ensures that each parent has a personalized understanding of their student's progress and action steps. Through intentional outreach, student-family data chats, and PLC review of participation data, we will create stronger school-home partnerships and meet our goal of engaging 80% of families with direct communication.

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.

All Teachers will make contact with parents/guardians of 80% of their students by the end of the 26-27 school year.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This will be monitored by contact data through Focus and teacher contact logs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Phillips

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:

Our school will implement targeted family engagement strategies to strengthen the connection between home and school and increase parent participation in academic events. Research shows that effective family-school partnerships are associated with improved student achievement, attendance, and social-emotional outcomes (National Association for Family, School, and Community Engagement [NAFSCE], 2020). The parent/guardian contact is intentionally in place to encourage

more involvement and collaboration between teachers and parents. This is a critical need to get parents involved, especially in critical areas such as state testing, at-risk/failing students, and graduation preparation are most relevant for families. This area was identified as a crucial need because past parent involvement rates have been below expectations, limiting opportunities to engage families as partners in student learning. Increasing parent participation during the year will directly support improvements in attendance, engagement, and academic outcomes by creating a stronger school-home partnership.

Rationale:
Parent involvement is directly linked to student success, particularly in attendance, engagement, and achievement. By targeting parent communication throughout the year, the school can address high-priority areas such as testing readiness, support for failing students, and graduation preparation. Through intentional outreach, student-family data chats, and PLC review of participation data, we will create stronger school-home partnerships and meet our goal of engaging 80% of families.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1
Individual communication with parents

Person Monitoring:
Phillips/Bump

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teachers will reach out to parents to have discussions to review their student's achievement, progress, behavior, and answer any questions the parent may have.

Action Step #2
Progress monitoring

Person Monitoring:
Phillips

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Track parent contact using contact logs though Focus and compare parent contact to the prior year.

Area of Focus #2

Multiple Early Warning Signs

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.

Mentoring is a proven intervention to improve student outcomes in behavior, attendance, and engagement. By embedding mentoring into our **EWS/MTSS framework**, students will receive consistent, personalized support from trusted adults. The combination of **individualized mentoring, bi-weekly progress monitoring, and family data chats** will ensure early intervention, reduce risk factors, and strengthen the overall school culture.

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.

100% of students enrolled in an MTSS class for behavioral or attendance concerns will be paired with a mentor and participate in **bi-weekly Mentoring Monday meetings**.

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.

Ms. Morse through mentor placement

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Morse

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:

Our school will implement a structured mentoring program linked to Early Warning Systems (EWS) to support students with behavioral and attendance concerns. Research shows that mentoring programs improve student engagement, reduce chronic absenteeism, and strengthen school connectedness, particularly when paired with data-driven early warning systems (Kern, Raudenbush, & Laska, 2019; NASEM, 2019). Students identified through MTSS for attendance or behavior risks will be matched with a staff mentor for regular check-ins, goal setting, and accountability. This area was identified as a crucial need because EWS data revealed that students with chronic absenteeism and repeated behavior incidents were disproportionately represented among those with academic failure. Providing consistent mentoring will help address root causes of disengagement, build stronger relationships, and increase student success.

Rationale:
Mentoring is a proven intervention to improve student outcomes in behavior, attendance, and engagement. By embedding mentoring into our EWS/MTSS framework, students will receive consistent, personalized support from trusted adults. The combination of individualized mentoring, bi-weekly progress monitoring, and family data chats will ensure early intervention, reduce risk factors, and strengthen the overall school culture.

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
Mentor Assignment

Person Monitoring:
Morse

By When/Frequency:
As needed

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Pair each MTSS student with a staff mentor for individualized support focused on attendance, behavior, and academic accountability.

Action Step #2
Bi-Weekly Mentoring Monday Meetings

Person Monitoring:
Morse

By When/Frequency:
Biweekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Implement structured mentoring check-ins every two weeks, where mentors and students review attendance, behavior, and academic data.

Action Step #3
Progress Monitoring:

Person Monitoring:
Bump/Guidance

By When/Frequency:
Every 2 weeks

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Use EWS dashboards, attendance reports, and behavior logs to monitor student progress and identify trends.

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, TSI, 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 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. **No**

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