

Walton County School District

VAN R. BUTLER ELEM. 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 | 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) | 32 |
| VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 35 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 36 |

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

In collaboration with families and our community, we inspire students to Become Empowered, Adventurous, Resilient Scholars.

Provide the school's vision statement

Creating a legacy where students will have a positive impact on their community.

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

Jennifer Hawthorne

Jennifer.hawthorne@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversees the process and implementation of the SIP and SIT throughout the school year.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Allison Harber

Allison.harber@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Leads the development and execution of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) throughout the year, with a focus on ELA for grades 3–5, including active participation in PLCs. Additionally, she is responsible for overseeing the implementation of Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) and the Ron Clark Academy (RCA) initiatives.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Hannah Gomillion

hannah.gomillion@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Leads the development and execution of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) throughout the year, with a focus on ELA for grades K-2, including active participation in PLCs. Additionally, she is responsible for overseeing the implementation of Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) and the Ron Clark Academy (RCA) initiatives.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Jenna Duplessis

jenna.duplessis@walton.k12.fl.us

Position Title

SIP Chair/Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Participate in and facilitate the SIP/SAC meetings throughout the year. Collaborates with K–5 Math and Science teachers to implement high-level teaching strategies and differentiate instruction to meet diverse student needs. Additionally, she will monitor and support instructional practices for targeted subgroups. She will also actively participate as a member of the Math/Science PLC teams.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Andi Battaglia

andi.g.battaglia@gmail.com

Position Title

Parent

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Parent members of the School Improvement Team provide the family perspective in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. They collaborate with staff to review data, establish goals, monitor progress, and support initiatives that address the academic and social-emotional needs of all students.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Kris Preteroti

kris10preteroti@yahoo.com

Position Title

Parent

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Parent members of the School Improvement Team provide the family perspective in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. They collaborate with staff to review data, establish goals, monitor progress, and support initiatives that address the academic and social-emotional needs of all students.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Lindsay Dillion

lindsay937@me.com

Position Title

Parent

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Parent members of the School Improvement Team provide the family perspective in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. They collaborate with staff to review

data, establish goals, monitor progress, and support initiatives that address the academic and social-emotional needs of all students.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Nicole Scott

nicole.scott001@gmail.com

Position Title

Parent

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Parent members of the School Improvement Team provide the family perspective in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. They collaborate with staff to review data, establish goals, monitor progress, and support initiatives that address the academic and social-emotional needs of all students.

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name

Erin Ricks

erinfeeney@comcast.net

Position Title

Parent

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Parent members of the School Improvement Team provide the family perspective in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. They collaborate with staff to review data, establish goals, monitor progress, and support initiatives that address the academic and social-emotional needs of all students.

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.

Van R. Butler Elementary creates its School Improvement Plan with input from the School Advisory Council, staff, parents, and community members. Using survey and assessment data, stakeholders identify where the school stands and how it can get better. Areas of focus and goals are created for the year while then approved by the school and the Walton County School Board. The plan is then monitored throughout the year by the school and its School Improvement Team.

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 plan is then monitored throughout the year by the school and its School Improvement Team.

C. Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE) | ACTIVE |
| SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE) | ELEMENTARY KG-5 |
| PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE) | K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION |
| 2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS | NO |
| 2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE | 32.2% |
| CHARTER SCHOOL | NO |
| RAISE SCHOOL | NO |
| 2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1 | N/A |
| ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG) | |
| 2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK) | STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL) |
| SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i> | 2024-25: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: A 2020-21: |

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

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

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| School Enrollment | 101 | 126 | 142 | 155 | 189 | 139 | | | 852 |
| Absent 10% or more school days | 8 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 8 | 11 | | | 62 |
| One or more suspensions | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 4 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 1 | | | 34 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | 14 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 4 | 10 | 11 | 19 | 17 | 17 | | | 78 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 3 | 12 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 8 | | | 49 |
| 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 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 4 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 5 | | | 44 |

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 | |
| Retained students: current year | 5 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 2 | | | | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | | | | | | | | | 0 |

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

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

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| Absent 10% or more school days | 13 | 23 | 20 | 30 | 39 | 22 | | | 147 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 | | | 15 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 2 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 15 | 4 | | | 39 |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4 | | | 23 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 4 | 12 | 26 | | 5 | 9 | | | 56 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 13 | 9 | 13 | | 6 | 6 | | | 47 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | 4 | 16 | 27 | 4 | | | | | 51 |
| 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 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 4 | | | 38 |

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 | |
| Retained students: current year | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

The district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT | SCHOOL | 2025 | | 2024 | | 2023** | | |
|--|--------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------|-----------------------|
| | | DISTRICT [†] | STATE [†] | SCHOOL | DISTRICT [†] | STATE [†] | SCHOOL | DISTRICT [†] |
| ELA Achievement* | | 76 | 70 | 59 | 75 | 67 | 57 | 69 |
| Grade 3 ELA Achievement | | 80 | 70 | 59 | 74 | 68 | 58 | 74 |
| ELA Learning Gains | | 66 | 66 | 60 | 69 | 65 | 60 | 60 |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | 57 | 62 | 56 | 66 | 61 | 57 | |
| Math Achievement* | | 86 | 77 | 64 | 82 | 74 | 62 | 82 |
| Math Learning Gains | | 77 | 69 | 63 | 64 | 69 | 62 | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | 69 | 56 | 51 | 49 | 57 | 52 | |
| Science Achievement | | 73 | 70 | 58 | 75 | 63 | 57 | 75 |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | 92 | | | 72 | 54 |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | | | |
| Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) | 82 | 69 | 63 | 67 | 59 | 61 | 49 | 65 |

*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 (FSSI) than in school grades calculation.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI

| | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students | 74% |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI | 666 |
| Total Components for the FPPI | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY

| 2024-25 | 2023-24 | 2022-23 | 2021-22 | 2020-21** | 2019-20* | 2018-19 |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|
| 74% | 69% | 74% | 65% | 65% | | 70% |

* 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 | 45% | No | | |
| English Language Learners | 59% | No | | |
| Asian Students | 80% | No | | |
| Black/African American Students | 60% | No | | |
| Hispanic Students | 58% | No | | |
| Multiracial Students | 84% | No | | |
| White Students | 77% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 66% | No | | |

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

| 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | GRAD RATE 2023-24 | C&C ACCEL 2023-24 | ELP PROGRESS |
|--|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | | | | |
| All Students | 76% | 80% | 66% | 57% | 86% | 77% | 69% | 73% | | | | | 82% |
| Students With Disabilities | 43% | 50% | 42% | 35% | 62% | 49% | 55% | 27% | | | | | |
| English Language Learners | 45% | 56% | 57% | 61% | 69% | 65% | 56% | 42% | | | | | 82% |
| Asian Students | 70% | | | | 90% | | | | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | 50% | | 67% | | 60% | 83% | | 42% | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | 51% | 61% | 52% | 57% | 67% | 62% | 50% | 44% | | | | | 82% |
| Multiracial Students | 77% | 75% | | | 100% | | | | | | | | |
| White Students | 82% | 84% | 69% | 58% | 90% | 78% | 75% | 82% | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 63% | 71% | 64% | 62% | 76% | 67% | 62% | 52% | | | | | 80% |

| 2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| | GRADE | ELA 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL.. | GRAD RATE 2022-23 | C&C ACCEL 2022-23 | ELP PROGRESS |
| All Students | 75% | 74% | 69% | 66% | 82% | 64% | 49% | 75% | | | 67% |
| Students With Disabilities | 43% | 50% | 42% | 48% | 51% | 47% | 45% | 42% | | | |
| English Language Learners | 38% | 50% | 59% | 58% | 62% | 43% | 41% | 40% | | | 67% |
| Asian Students | 63% | | 62% | | 88% | 62% | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | 88% | | 83% | | 76% | 58% | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | 53% | 47% | 66% | 59% | 66% | 51% | 38% | 42% | | | 67% |
| Multiracial Students | 82% | | 67% | | 82% | 50% | | | | | |
| White Students | 79% | 80% | 68% | 71% | 86% | 69% | 49% | 85% | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 64% | 67% | 65% | 64% | 71% | 57% | 46% | 53% | | | 67% |

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG L25% | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG L25% | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACH. | GRAD RATE 2021-22 | C&C ACCEL 2021-22 | ELP PROGRESS |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| All Students | 69% | 74% | | | 82% | | | 75% | | | | 49% |
| Students With Disabilities | 37% | 42% | | | 64% | | | 44% | | | | |
| English Language Learners | 31% | 30% | | | 65% | | | 47% | | | | 70% |
| Asian Students | 64% | | | | 100% | | | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | 47% | | | | 58% | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | 44% | 52% | | | 67% | | | 61% | | | | 67% |
| Multiracial Students | 83% | | | | 94% | | | | | | | |
| White Students | 77% | 81% | | | 86% | | | 80% | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 54% | 62% | | | 70% | | | 64% | | | | 70% |

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

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

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

| 2024-25 SPRING | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------------|-------|----------------|--|
| SUBJECT | GRADE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | SCHOOL - DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL - STATE | |
| ELA | 3 | 75% | 68% | 7% | 57% | 18% | |
| ELA | 4 | 70% | 67% | 3% | 56% | 14% | |
| ELA | 5 | 72% | 65% | 7% | 56% | 16% | |
| Math | 3 | 88% | 78% | 10% | 63% | 25% | |
| Math | 4 | 86% | 73% | 13% | 62% | 24% | |
| Math | 5 | 74% | 67% | 7% | 57% | 17% | |
| Science | 5 | 70% | 67% | 3% | 55% | 15% | |

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 math data showed strong performance, with 86% of students achieving proficiency, notable learning gains, and significant growth among our bottom quartile students. ELA results were also impressive, with 80% of students reaching proficiency. Our kindergarten through 2nd grade data was also exceptional; while it is not factored into the school grade, it provides a strong foundation that will benefit our students in the years ahead.

Lowest Performance

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

While our ELA proficiency was strong at 80%, our learning gains for bottom quartile students in ELA were 57%, indicating an area for focused improvement. We will be particularly attentive to our ELL subgroup, ensuring targeted supports are in place. It is essential that we align scheduling and instructional "can do" statements closely with the curriculum to maximize growth opportunities for these students.

Greatest Decline

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

No Answer Entered

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.

No Answer Entered

EWS Areas of Concern

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

No Answer Entered

Highest Priorities

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

A key factor in our success was having ESE teachers push into classrooms rather than pulling students out, allowing for more inclusive and consistent instruction. This, combined with strong collaboration among teachers, instructional support staff, and administration, created a cohesive approach that directly contributed to our positive outcomes. It will be essential to continue and strengthen these practices to sustain and build upon our success.

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Our 2024–2025 ELA/Reading proficiency is 80%, showing strong performance but still leaving room for growth, particularly with our ELL subgroup and bottom quartile students. This year, we will focus on accelerating learning for all students, with targeted strategies to close achievement gaps while maintaining high expectations.

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.

By the end of the 25-26 school year, 75% of all students in grades 4-5 will demonstrate a learning gain from PM3 of the previous year based to PM3 on this year's FAST Assessment.

Monitoring

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

The Administrative Team will review whole-group and subgroup data after each assessment window, with grade-level teams holding data chats to adjust instruction as needed. Individual teacher meetings will be scheduled for targeted support. Monitoring will also involve key staff: Guidance Counselor and T3 Reading Teacher (Tier 2 & 3 MTSS students), Newcomer/ELL Lead Teacher (ELL students), ESE Teachers (ESE students), Grade Chairs/PLC Facilitators (grade-level subgroups), BEAR Intervention Teachers (students in interventions), and all teachers monitoring classroom data for their subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Allison Harber & Hannah Gomillion

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Teachers will use district screeners throughout the year to guide differentiated interventions during BEAR Time and receive training on intervention programs. Small-group and differentiated instruction will be implemented consistently during the ELA block, with tutoring available year-round for subgroups. ELL and ESE students will receive targeted supports, including plan reviews, co-teaching, push-in assistance, and differentiated interventions. The Reading Coach and district ELA CAP resources, along with AVID strategies in 3rd–5th grades, will be used with fidelity. Tier 3 Reading teachers will provide small-group instruction for lowest-performing students to promote growth and relationship-building.

Rationale:

District screeners ensure interventions target the right skills and are implemented with fidelity. Differentiated instruction, small groups, and tutoring help students fill foundational gaps and promote long-term success. The Reading Coach and CAP resources support collaboration and effective implementation of the district reading plan. AVID strategies, including WICOR and focused note-taking, build essential skills and help reduce opportunity and achievement gaps. Co-teaching and Tier 3 small-group instruction provide deeper learning, strengthen relationships, and maximize outcomes for ELL and ESE students.

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

Provide training on screener data analysis and correct intervention selection.

Person Monitoring:**By When/Frequency:****Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Offer targeted professional development on interpreting ELA screener data (e.g., I-Ready, DIBELS, FAST) to ensure appropriate and timely intervention placement for students.

Action Step #2

Identify and share high-impact instructional strategies during PLCs.

Person Monitoring:**By When/Frequency:****Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Use PLC time to collaboratively analyze student data and identify evidence-based instructional strategies that address identified ELA skill gaps and support differentiated instruction.

Action Step #3

Design and implement high level Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questions aligned to ALDs.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

During PLCs, develop rigorous, standards-aligned questions and model student responses that reflect higher-order thinking and are calibrated to Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs).

Action Step #4

Incorporate AVID instructional strategies into PLC conversations and lesson planning.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Intentionally integrate AVID strategies—such as focused notetaking, inquiry-based discussions, and organizational tools—into PLC planning to support literacy development across content areas.

Action Step #5

Establish Lexia unit completion goals and celebrate student progress.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Set incremental, data-informed Lexia Core5 or PowerUp unit goals by grade level and recognize student growth through school-wide or classroom-based celebrations to motivate continued engagement.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Our 2024–2025 math proficiency is 86%, showing strong overall performance and growth in several subgroups. We will continue to focus on accelerating learning for all students, with particular attention to subgroups such as ELL students, to close achievement gaps while maintaining high expectations.

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.

By the end of the 2025–26 school year, 75% of all students will demonstrate a learning gain from PM3 of the previous year, to PM3 on this year's FAST Assessment.

Monitoring

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

The Administrative Team will review whole-group and subgroup data after each assessment window, with grade-level teams holding data chats to adjust instruction as needed. Individual teacher meetings will be scheduled for targeted support. Monitoring will also involve key staff: Guidance Counselor and T3 Reading Teacher (Tier 2 & 3 MTSS students), Newcomer/ELL Lead Teacher (ELL students), ESE Teachers (ESE students), Grade Chairs/PLC Facilitators (grade-level subgroups), BEAR Intervention Teachers (students in interventions), and all teachers monitoring classroom data for their subgroups. Student subgroups will be identified by Labor Day each year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Hannah Gomillion & Allison Harber

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:

Math support will be provided in small groups during BEAR Intervention Time, with after-school tutoring beginning after the first progress monitoring window and continuing year-round, emphasizing additional support for subgroups. Teachers will utilize district Math CAP resources and the guidance of the Math Coach, and will have opportunities to collaborate and observe other classrooms throughout the year.

Rationale:

Differentiated small-group instruction helps teachers address student needs more effectively, while tutoring and peer tutoring provide opportunities to fill foundational gaps. Our Math Coach supports the implementation of the district math plan, and Math CAP resources allow for collaboration across teachers and schools. Collective teacher efficacy and classroom visitation programs give teachers opportunities to learn, improve, and implement high-quality instruction.

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

Identify and share high-impact instructional strategies during PLC.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Use PLC time to collaboratively analyze student data and identify evidence-based instructional strategies that address identified math skill gaps and support differentiated instruction.

Action Step #2

Design and implement high-level Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questions aligned to the ALDs.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

During PLCs, develop rigorous, standards-aligned questions and model student responses that reflect higher-order thinking and are calibrated to Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs).

Action Step #3

Provide quarterly assessments that serve as a pretest to better differentiate instruction.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Teachers will develop quarterly assessments in PLCs to ensure common grading and common testing with rigorous content. Teachers will identify cumulative data by giving quarterly assessments and disaggregating the data to ensure that they are remediating and reteaching based on the needs of the students.

Action Step #4

Intentional BEAR Time is focused on math for those that require it.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Teachers will provide intentional differentiation with fidelity during their BEAR block. Teachers will use data to identify specific intervention needs for students and provide differentiated instruction based on individual needs.

Action Step #5

Incorporate AVID instructional strategies into PLC conversations and lesson planning.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Intentionally integrate AVID strategies—such as focused notetaking, inquiry-based discussions, and organizational tools—into PLC planning to support literacy development across content areas.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Our 2024–2025 science proficiency is 73%, maintaining last year's level. We will focus on accelerating growth for all students, with particular attention to subgroups such as ELL, socio-economic, and Hispanic students, to close achievement gaps while maintaining high expectations.

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.

By the end of the 2025–26 school year, 75% of all 5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency on the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring

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

The Administrative Team will review whole-group and subgroup data after each assessment window, with grade-level teams holding data chats to adjust instruction as needed. Individual teacher meetings will be scheduled for targeted support. Monitoring will also involve key staff: Guidance Counselor and T3 Reading Teacher (Tier 2 & 3 MTSS students), Newcomer/ELL Lead Teacher (ELL students), ESE Teachers (ESE students), Grade Chairs/PLC Facilitators (grade-level subgroups), BEAR Intervention Teachers (students in interventions), and all teachers monitoring classroom data for their subgroups. Student subgroups will be identified by Labor Day each year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

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:

At least one 5th grade teacher will attend the District Summer Science CAP, and 5th grade teachers will use CAP and FCIMS resources. 3rd and 4th grade teachers will work with the district Science Coach and use the district curriculum and FCIMS resources. Study Island will support students in areas of weakness identified through assessments and classroom instruction.

Rationale:

CAP resources help teachers implement the newly adopted curriculum and provide opportunities to collaborate with other teachers and schools. FCIMS resources align with state assessment specifications and include former test items. These resources also allow targeted support to be assigned based on student needs.

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

Identify and share high-impact instructional strategies during PLC.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Use PLC time to collaboratively analyze student data and identify evidence-based instructional strategies that address identified science skill gaps and support differentiated instruction.

Action Step #2

Collaborate with other schools to determine best practices.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Teachers will collaborate with other schools in the district in an effort to ensure that the highest level of academic questioning is achieved.

Action Step #3

Incorporate AVID instructional strategies into PLC conversations and lesson planning.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Intentionally integrate AVID strategies—such as focused notetaking, inquiry-based discussions, and organizational tools—into PLC planning to support literacy development across content areas.

Action Step #4

Design and implement high-level Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questions aligned to the ALDs.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

During PLCs, develop rigorous, standards-aligned questions and model student responses that reflect higher-order thinking and are calibrated to Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs).

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.

No Answer Entered

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.

By the end of the 2025–26 school year, 80% of grade groups will improve their rating on a PLC team survey created by researcher Mike Mattos.

Monitoring

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

PLC teams will meet every other week: ELA on Tuesdays, Math on Thursdays, and Science during grade-level meetings. Kindergarten and 1st grade will meet as a grade level, while 2nd–5th grade will meet by ELA/Math department. A leadership team member will support each PLC, and the facilitator sets the focus while the recorder keeps minutes. Attendance will be tracked, and teams will analyze weekly data, with quarterly progress monitoring shared by leadership.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

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:

Research-based professional learning communities that focus on collaboration, data analysis, and inquiry create a foundation for success for all stakeholders.

Rationale:

Previous PLCs provided focus but did not fully address the learning needs of all students. By using this model and concentrating on key questions—what every student should learn, how we will know they have learned it, how we will support students who are struggling, and how we will challenge students who are already proficient—staff, students, and parents will experience academic and social-emotional growth throughout the school year.

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

Offer the DuFour PLC book to all staff members that are interested.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Provide interested staff members with a copy of the DuFour PLC book to support their understanding and implementation of professional learning communities.

Action Step #2

Hold role meetings with admin to develop experts within PLC.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Conduct role-specific meetings with administrators to build expertise and leadership skills within PLCs.

Action Step #3

Admin will provide ongoing feedback to PLC members.

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

Administrators will give continuous feedback to PLC members to support growth, improve collaboration, and ensure effective implementation of strategies.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

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.

Van R. Butler will focus on building positive relationships among staff, students, parents, and the community. We will use *Capturing Kids' Hearts* strategies to strengthen connections between students and teachers, create classroom social contracts to support expected behaviors from *The Essential 55*, and reward students with House Points for exemplary behavior through the Ron Clark Academy system.

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.

Van R. Butler will implement proactive strategies this school year to decrease the number of student disciplinary referrals.

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.

Classrooms and learning teams will create social contracts, CKH methods, and sorted into Houses to hold each other accountable. The Leadership Team will continue to monitor discipline data throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

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:

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

CKH Teacher Training

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

All Van R Butler Teachers will attend CKH training.

Action Step #2

CKH Strategy Implementation

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

All teachers will incorporate CKH strategies learned through trainings to include Good Things, Greetings at the Door, Social Contracts and 4 Check-in/Check-out questions for discipline.

Action Step #3

Ron Clark House Implementation

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

All staff members and students will be sorted into Houses. Students will earn House points by demonstrating the expectations within The Essential 55.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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

Dissemination Methods

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

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

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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

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

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

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

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

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

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

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

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

Process to Review the Use of Resources

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

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

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

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

No

| BUDGET | | ACTIVITY | FUNCTION/ OBJECT | FUNDING SOURCE | FTE | AMOUNT |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
| School Areas of Focus | AVID | Instructional Practice - ELA | 0/ | UNISIG | 0.0 | 3,599.00 |
| School Areas of Focus | supplies | Instructional Practice - Math | 0/ | UNISIG | 0.0 | 2,557.00 |
| School Areas of Focus | supplies | Instructional Practice - Science | 0/ | UNISIG | 0.0 | 2,556.00 |
| School Areas of Focus | Learning Communities | Instructional Practice - Professional | 0/ | UNISIG | 0.0 | 2,556.00 |
| Total | School Areas of Focus | | | | 11,268.00 | 11,268.00 |
| Plan Budget Total | | | | | | |