Brevard Public Schools

HARBOR CITY ELEMENTARY 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 6

D. Early Warning Systems 7

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 40

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 45

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 50

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 52

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

Empowering learners through high-quality instruction, differentiated support, and commitment to growth.

Provide the school's vision statement

At Harbor City Elementary School, we are committed to delivering high-quality, systematic, and explicit instruction that empowers every student to take ownership of and be engaged in their learning. Through intentional scaffolding and differentiation, students achieve mastery of grade-level benchmarks, while a culture of feedback and tiered support fosters continuous growth for both students and staff.

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

Christine Boyd

boyd.christine@brevardschools.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support and implement actions steps as they relate to the SIP goals, ensuring the leadership team implements with fidelity, observing and providing feedback to both coaches and teachers.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name
Lauren Edwards-Hollis

edwards-hollis.lauren@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist Principal in supporting and implementing actions steps as they relate to the SIP goals, ensuring the leadership team implements with fidelity, observing and providing feedback to both coaches and teachers.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Emily Davis

davis.emily@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Plan and implement collaborative planning, professional learning, the coaching cycle, and observations with feedback for ELA, small groups, and interventions. Implement action steps as outlined in SIP plan for ELA, RAISE, and SWD.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Michelle Hume

hume.michelle@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Math Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Plan and implement collaborative planning, professional learning, the coaching cycle, and observations with feedback for math, small groups, and interventions. Implement action steps as outlined in SIP plan for Math and SWD.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name
Lisa Flay

flay.lisa@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Title One Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist and implement tiered intervention groups in ELA and Math. As well as engaging parents and families, targeting the SIP goals that include ELA, Math, SWD, and Attendance.

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.

Harbor City Elementary values stakeholder engagement in the development, implementation, and continuous improvement of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Staff, families, and community members were provided multiple opportunities to contribute feedback regarding the 2025–2026 SIP goals and outcomes, as well as the development of the 2026–2027 SIP goals. Input was gathered during the end-of-year School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting and the Title I End-of-Year Family Engagement Night. Additionally, parents were invited to participate in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process for the 2025–2026 school year. Families also provided valuable feedback through the Harbor City Elementary and Brevard Public Schools Title I surveys. Based on stakeholder input and identified needs, the School Leadership Team developed the evolving 2026–2027 SIP. The plan was shared with faculty, the SAC, and Harbor City Elementary families during pre-planning, the beginning-of-year SAC meeting, and the Title I Annual Meeting to ensure ongoing collaboration and transparency throughout the school improvement process.

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 2026–2027 SIP will be monitored continuously throughout the school year to ensure effective implementation and progress toward focus area goals. Student and subgroup data will be reviewed during grade-level Impact Meetings, while the Title I Mid-Year Program Review will assess student achievement, academic trends, and SIP implementation. Data from walkthroughs, data chats, and collaborative planning sessions will guide ongoing revisions to the SIP and support continuous school improvement.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**ELEMENTARY** **PK-6**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**100.0%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**YES**
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	**ATSI**
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: B** **2024-25: C** **2023-24: B** **2022-23: B** **2021-22: B**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

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									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	19	47	35	53	64	43	45			306
Absent 10% or more school days	4	11	9	9	10	7	13			63
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	5	3	8	8			30
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	16	10			41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	1	4	7	10	14			36
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	0	0	4	11	18	4			37
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	3	12	11	7			33

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									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	2	5	5	11			25

Current Year 2026-27

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	0	0	0	6	0	0	0			6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	2			3

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	36	48	56	82	45	41	42			350
Absent 10% or more school days	11	16	12	12	6	16	18			91
One or more suspensions		4	7	6	5	2	7			31
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				1	2	2	7			12
Course failure in Math					1	3	1			5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		10	22	36	8	11	12			99
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		9	16	39	6	9	18			97
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	3	17	23	26						69
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		8	12	13	25					58

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators		6	12	11	6	8	12			55

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

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year		3		15	1					19
Students retained two or more times				1		1				2

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 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*	53	65	62	45	62	59	57	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	60	63	61	35	58	59	58	59	58
ELA Learning Gains	60	67	63	49	62	60	60	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59	61	58	58	57	56	59	60	57
Math Achievement*	51	66	66	55	63	64	65	62	62
Math Learning Gains	63	68	64	59	67	63	65	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52	55	50	46	54	51	50	59	52
Science Achievement	55	66	62	42	62	58	39	60	57
Social Studies Achievement*			95			92			
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					62	63		57	61

*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)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	57%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	453
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
57%	51%	58%	61%	55%	52%	

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	43%	No		
English Language Learners	43%	No		
Black/African American Students	35%	Yes	3	
Hispanic Students	56%	No		
Multiracial Students	55%	No		
White Students	60%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	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	53%	60%	60%	59%	51%	63%	52%	55%					
Students With Disabilities	27%	37%	50%	59%	27%	56%	44%						
English Language Learners	33%		50%		27%	60%							
Black/African American Students	22%		40%		28%	50%							
Hispanic Students	49%	53%	56%	60%	49%	68%		60%					
Multiracial Students	50%		76%		36%	59%							
White Students	62%	73%	62%	46%	54%	62%	58%	62%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	47%	53%	55%	62%	48%	55%	41%	48%					

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	45%	35%	49%	58%	55%	59%	46%	42%					67%
Students With Disabilities	19%	26%	45%	50%	28%	44%	35%	8%					
English Language Learners	33%		40%	40%	47%	73%	60%						67%
Black/African American Students	24%				29%								
Hispanic Students	46%	18%	57%	50%	54%	68%	64%						62%
Multiracial Students	39%		47%		57%	73%							
White Students	47%	35%	43%	50%	59%	53%	27%	48%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	41%	31%	53%	60%	51%	59%	40%	26%					50%

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	57%	58%	60%	59%	65%	65%	50%	39%					67%
Students With Disabilities	24%	29%	51%	53%	41%	57%	27%	17%					
English Language Learners	18%		64%		18%	45%							67%
Black/African American Students	27%				36%								
Hispanic Students	57%	64%	65%		57%	65%							77%
Multiracial Students	56%		69%		75%	85%							
White Students	59%	68%	60%	68%	68%	65%	52%	52%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	54%	60%	57%	62%	61%	40%	40%					

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	3	60%	63%	-3%	60%	0%
ELA	4	33%	61%	-28%	60%	-27%
ELA	5	55%	62%	-7%	61%	-6%
ELA	6	60%	74%	-14%	62%	-2%
Math	3	43%	66%	-23%	66%	-23%
Math	4	62%	62%	0%	65%	-3%
Math	5	43%	58%	-15%	62%	-19%
Math	6	55%	74%	-19%	60%	-5%
Science	5	55%	64%	-9%	60%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Most Improvement

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

The data component showing the most improvement was Grade 3 ELA Achievement, which increased significantly from 35% to 60% (+25 points) from 24/25 to 25/26. 23/24 3rd grade ELA was 56% proficient. For the 25/26 school year, the district average was 65% and the state average was 61%.

ELA achievement increased across grade levels.

ELA | PM1 | PM2 | PM3 | State Percentage | District Percentage | Increase Percent from PM1 to PM3 | 24/25 PM 3 to 25/26 PM3

3rd | 8% | 31% | 60% | 61% | 65% | 51% | 34% +25%

4th | 11% | 26% | 34% | 61% | 62% | 23% | 51% -17%

5th | 23% | 31% | 60% | 61% | 63% | 37% | 35% +24%

6th | 43% | 46% | 60% | 62% | 76% | 17% | 56% +4%

This improvement can be attributed to several targeted actions:

- Consistent weekly small group instruction aligned to FAST data
- Implementation of Science of Reading professional development
- Strong use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions
- Monthly subgroup data monitoring
- Increased family literacy engagement
- Improved vertical alignment and benchmark unpacking during collaborative planning

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 was Grade 4 ELA proficiency at 34%, significantly below the state average (~61%), and below the district average of 62%.
In 23-24 47% of students were proficient and in 24-25 51% were proficient.

Contributing factors include:

- Inconsistent rigor and productive struggle in Tier 1 instruction
- Gaps in vertical alignment and prerequisite skill mastery
- Lack of consistent facilitation during collaborative planning, impacting lesson quality
- Limited use of structured agendas and pre-work, reducing planning effectiveness
- Intervention time interfering with core instruction, reducing Tier 1 exposure

Trends indicate that while early grades are improving, middle elementary (especially grade 4) is a transition point where rigor increases but instructional practices are not yet fully aligned.

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 seen in:

- Grade 4 ELA: -17%
- Grade 6 Math: -16% -24-25 72% proficient, dropping to 56% proficient in 25-26. The state average was 62% and district average was 77%. 23-24 77% of students were proficient.
- Grade 3 Math: -5% -24-25 47% proficient, dropping to 47% proficient in 25-26. The state average was 67% and the district average was 68%. 23-24 64% of students were proficient.

Contributing factors include:

- Math receiving less emphasis in collaborative planning, as noted in the coherence reflection
- Lack of math teacher leader/coach or strong facilitation
- Inconsistent implementation of instructional strategies in math
- Gaps in alignment between Tier 1 instruction and intervention supports
- Insufficient student practice with rigorous, standards-aligned tasks

Greatest Gap

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap compared to the state average is in:

- Grade 3 Math (42% vs. ~67% state = -25 points)
- Grade 4 ELA (34% vs. ~61% state = -27 points)
- Black/Af. Am. ESSA subgroup continues to score below the 41% Federal Index. In 24-25 this ESSA subgroups was at 27%, though for the 25-26 school year this increased to 35%, an increase of 8%, this subgroup continues to score the lowest of any subgroup and continue to fall below the 41%.

Contributing factors include:

- Inconsistent rigor and cognitive demand in instruction
- Lack of systematic math planning and coaching
- Uneven instructional coherence across grade levels

Trends show that while growth is occurring, the school still lags behind the state in key tested areas requiring deep conceptual understanding.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Average Daily Attendance in 6th grade is lower than the overall percentage of 93%, scoring 90% as a grade level. 33% of 6th grade studnets attended less than 90% of the year.

Highest Priorities

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

Strengthen Tier 1 Instructional Rigor and Gradual Release (I do, We do, You do) in 2nd Grade ELA
Improve Math Achievement through Structured PLCs, Coaching, and Leadership
Enhance Collaborative Planning with Clear Agendas, Facilitation, and Accountability In 4th Grade ELA
Lower the percentage of students with chronic absences and increase average daily attendance in 6th grade.

Target our ESSA subgroup; Black/African American students with interventions, high quality tier I instruction, as well as supports to increase average daily attendance.

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.

For the 25-26 school year, the ELA Proficiency in 4th Grade was 33%. This is significantly below the state average of 60% and the district average of 61%. 4th grade did not meet HCES School Improvement Goal of 54% this past year.

This data indicates a need to strengthen literacy instruction, to improve overall ELA achievement and close gaps with state and district performance.

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.

In 2027, the percent of 4th grade students proficient (3+) on the ELA assessment will increase from 33% to 54%.

Monitoring

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

• Data Analysis: Analyze student work and assessment data after collaborative planning cycles to determine whether instructional adjustments are improving student outcomes.

• Quarterly Monitoring: Revisit data each quarter and adjust action steps as needed.

• Walkthrough Alignment: Conduct classroom walkthroughs in Tier 1 core classrooms and Tier 2

support to look for evidence that agreed-upon content and instructional practices from collaborative planning are visible in instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:
Explicit Instruction and Teacher Clarity: This is an evidence-based and structured approach where teachers model and explain skills, guide practice, and gradually release responsibility (I Do, We Do, You Do), with sequenced instruction, frequent checks for understanding, feedback, and practice opportunities. Teacher clarity ensures students understand what they are learning, why it matters, and how success will be measured

Rationale:
Explicit Instruction and Teacher Clarity will improve comprehension, mastery, and retention of content while addressing learning gaps. Effective implementation requires collaborative planning, aligned outcomes across all teachers (gen ed, ESE), and a student-centered environment which will create coherence for learners.

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
Quarter 1:

Person Monitoring:
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Establish a master schedule that protects weekly common collaborative planning time for content teachers and support facilitators.
* Conduct professional learning with Literacy Coach on delivering explicit instruction of standards-aligned district-adopted curriculum including planning lessons that include clear modeling, guided practice with feedback, and checks for understanding (CFUs).
• Develop and implement instructional non-negotiables for teacher clarity (e.g., posted learning intentions and success criteria, daily modeling, guided practice, checks for understanding, and student discourse expectations). By QUARTER and By ROLE Include Baseline and tie to Strategic

Plan Goal
* Define expectations and create schedule for support facilitator participation in Tier 1 planning, instructional delivery, data review, walk-throughs, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring.
* Set expectation for use of standards-aligned curriculum materials across Tier 1 and intervention as the first source for instruction.
* Plan and communicate a system for monitoring to include calendar for classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning calendar, and coaching cycle calendar.
* Create and/or calibrate walkthrough tool with leadership team.
*Set inclusive practices as a high-level expectation.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Facilitate professional learning on explicit instruction and clarity when delivering instruction on standards-aligned implementation of Benchmark Advance curriculum.
• Model lessons demonstrating instructional non-negotiables with standards-aligned curriculum.
*Include ESE teachers in all aspects of planning, focusing on SID.
• Support teachers in planning standards-aligned lessons that include clear modeling, guided practice, and checks for understanding (CFUs).
• Conduct coaching cycles focused on strengthening standards alignment, lesson structure, gradual release, and checks for understanding.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Collaboratively plan standards-aligned learning intentions and success criteria using Benchmark Advance curriculum and district guides.
• Implement instructional non-negotiables daily (modeling, guided practice with feedback, independent practice, CFUs).
• Participate in coaching cycles and apply feedback to instruction.
*ESE teachers fully participate in grade level sessions, student data folders, planning, instructional delivery, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring.
*Pull small ELA intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

Action Step #2
Quarter 2:

Person Monitoring:
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Monitor PLC implementation monthly to ensure Tier 1 and intervention teachers collaboratively plan around grade-level standards and prerequisite skills.
• Conduct weekly walkthroughs using a common look-for tool aligned to instructional non negotiables and provide actionable feedback to teachers, support facilitators and coaches. • Run structured data meetings where teachers look at student data together and figure out how what students are learning in core instruction (Tier 1) connects to and guide the extra help they get in intervention
• Provide PD on how to use student data to move students between Tier 1 and intervention more effectively. Example: Deep dive and edit into BPS slide deck, student exit tickets/mini assessments, determine what level of support students need.
* Review data collected and fidelity of schedule with support facilitator involvement with walk-throughs, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Lead PLCs in analyzing student work/data to identify standards-based misconceptions and needed scaffolds.

• Continue coaching cycles with targeted feedback on implementation of explicit instruction, clarity and standards-based lesson delivery.
• Model explicit instruction (clear modeling, think-alouds, guided practice, and gradual release) during small-group and whole-group lessons.
• Support teachers in aligning intervention support to prerequisite skills needed for Tier 1 success.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Plan together in PLCs using explicit instruction routines (I Do, We Do, You Do) for Tier 1 instruction and how will implementation be strengthened each quarter.
• Use explicit instruction daily, including modeling, guided practice, and independent practice.
*Keep instructional routines and expectations consistent across classrooms and support settings.
• Adjust instruction based on student data, using CFUs to guide next steps.
*ESE teachers participate in grade level sessions, student data folders, planning, instructional delivery, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring.
*Pull small ELA intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

Action Step #3
Quarter 3:

Person Monitoring:
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Identify instructional gaps using walkthrough and data trends.
• Inspect intervention for connections directly to what students are learning in Tier 1
• Highlight and level-up high-impact instructional practices. Spot strong classrooms using explicit instruction well and share those practices via peer observations.
* Review data, reflect, and adjust scheduled items with support facilitator involvement with walk-throughs, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring as needed.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Continue to model strong explicit instruction in both whole group and small group settings (clear modeling, think-alouds, guided practice).
• Differentiate coaching cycles based on teacher/student performance data. Help teachers improve lesson delivery—especially pacing, modeling, and guided practice.
• Coach teachers on using student data during lessons to adjust instruction in the moment.
• Lead PLC conversations on how explicit instruction is impacting student mastery of standards. Identify trends – strengths and weaknesses and create a plan to reteach as needed.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Use exit tickets, quick checks, and quizzes to identify specific skill gaps, then adjust the next lesson (Tier 1, reteach, or enrichment) to target those needs.
*Implement adjusting instruction in the moment and reteaching as needed in Teir 1 and Teir 2 instruction.
• Strengthen modeling by breaking skills into clear steps, using think-alouds to show the thinking process, and guiding students through practice before independent work.
• Follow curriculum closely to ensure Tier 1 and intervention teach the same skills with consistent language, pacing, and routines.
• Collaborate regularly across Gen Ed, ESE, and ELL teams to ensure consistent routines, expectations, and instructional practices across all learning settings.
*ESE teachers fully participate in grade level sessions, student data folders, planning, instructional delivery, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring.

*Pull small ELA intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

Action Step #4
Quarter 4:

Person Monitoring:
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Review achievement data and walkthroughs to see how well Tier 1 and intervention are working together.
• When data shows students are not making expected gains, put extra supports in place (reteach blocks, added intervention time, “all hands-on deck” scheduling, focused small groups).
• Focus support on bubble students and students close to proficiency to maximize learning gains.
* Review data, reflect, and adjust scheduled items with support facilitator involvement with walk-throughs, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring as needed.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Help teams analyze data to identify students not yet making progress and specific skill gaps.
• Support planning for reteach, enrichment, and small-group intervention based on student needs.
• Model and support “all hands-on deck” response strategies (targeted groups, flexible grouping, intensive reteach cycles).
• Share strong examples of effective Tier 1 and intervention instruction tied to student growth.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Review student data to identify who needs to reteach, enrichment, or extra support.
• Adjust instruction quickly when students are not mastering skills (reteach in Tier 1 or intervention groups).
• Focus instruction on bubble students to help move them to proficiency and increase learning gains.
• Use flexible grouping and collaborate across teams to provide extra support when needed.
*ESE teachers
participate in grade level sessions, student data folders, planning, instructional delivery, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring.
*Pull small ELA intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

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.

Math proficiency trended down, below state and district average, in 3rd grade.

3rd grade proficiency in 25-26 was 43% with district and state average at 66%.

This data indicate a need to strengthen math instruction, to improve overall Math achievement and close gaps with district and state performance.

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.

In 2027, the percent of students proficient (3+) on the Math Assessment, in 3rd grade, will increase from 43% to 54%.

Monitoring

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

• Data Analysis: Analyze student work and assessment data after collaborative planning cycles to determine whether instructional adjustments are improving student outcomes.

• Quarterly Monitoring: Analyze both walkthrough and academic data each quarter and adjust action steps as needed.

• Walkthrough Alignment: Conduct classroom walkthroughs in Tier 1 core classrooms and Tier 2 support to look for evidence that agreed-upon content and instructional practices from collaborative planning are visible in instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Michelle Hume, Math Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Explicit Instruction and Teacher Clarity: This is an evidence-based and structured approach where teachers model and explain skills, guide practice, and gradually release responsibility (I Do, We Do, You Do), with sequenced instruction, frequent checks for understanding, feedback, and practice opportunities. Teacher clarity ensures students understand what they are learning, why it matters, and how success will be measured.

Rationale:

Explicit Instruction and Teacher Clarity will improve comprehension, mastery, and retention of content

while addressing learning gaps. Effective implementation requires collaborative planning, aligned outcomes across all teachers (gen ed, ESE), and a student-centered environment which will create coherence for learners.

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
Quarter 1:

Person Monitoring:
Michelle Hume, Math Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Establish a master schedule that protects weekly common collaborative planning time for content teachers and support facilitators.
* Conduct professional learning with Title One Teacher/Coach(T) on delivering explicit instruction of standards-aligned district-adopted curriculum including: planning lessons that include clear modeling, guided practice with feedback, and checks for understanding (CFUs).
• Develop and implement instructional non-negotiables for teacher clarity (e.g., posted learning intentions and success criteria, daily modeling, guided practice with specific feedback, checks for understanding, and student discourse expectations). By QUARTER and By ROLE Include Baseline and tie to Strategic Plan Goal
* Define expectations and create schedule for support facilitator participation in Tier 1 planning, instructional delivery, and data review.
* Set expectation for use of standards-aligned curriculum materials across Tier 1 and intervention as the first source for instruction.
* Plan and communicate a system for monitoring to include: calendar for classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning calendar, and coaching cycle calendar.
* Create and/or calibrate walkthrough tool with leadership team and ESE SS.
Math Coach Actions:
• Facilitate professional learning on explicit instruction and clarity when delivering instruction on standards-aligned implementation of Reveal curriculum.
• Model lessons demonstrating instructional non-negotiables with standards-aligned curriculum.
• Support teachers in planning standards-aligned lessons that include clear modeling, guided practice with specific feedback, diving into the Big M, and checks for understanding (CFUs).
• Conduct coaching cycles focused on strengthening standards alignment, lesson structure, gradual release, and checks for understanding.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Collaboratively plan standards-aligned learning intentions and success criteria using Reveal curriculum, the Big M, and district guides.
• Implement instructional non-negotiables daily (modeling, guided practice with feedback, independent practice, CFUs).

• Participate in coaching cycles and apply corrective feedback to instruction in a timely manner.
*Pull small math intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

Action Step #2
Quarter 2:

Person Monitoring:
Michelle Hume

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Monitor and support PLC implementation monthly to ensure Tier 1 and intervention teachers collaboratively plan around grade-level standards and prerequisite skills.
• Conduct weekly walkthroughs using a common look-for tool aligned to instructional non negotiables and provide actionable timely feedback to teachers, support facilitators and coaches.
• Facilitate structured data meetings where teachers analyze student data to identify student needs and adjust support based on students' response to Tier 1 instruction and connect and guide the extra help they get in intervention.
• Provide PD on how to use student data to move students between Tier 1 and intervention more effectively. Example: Math slide decks, the Big M, student exit tickets/mini assessments, determine what level of support students need.
* SWD planning structures added to collaborative planning sessions and continue progress monitoring.
Math Coach(T) Actions:
• Lead PLCs in analyzing student work/data to identify standards-based misconceptions and needed scaffolds.
• Continue coaching cycles with targeted and timely feedback on implementation of explicit instruction, clarity and standards-based lesson delivery.
• Model explicit instruction (clear modeling, guided practice with specific feedback, and gradual release) during small-group and whole-group lessons.
• Support teachers in aligning intervention support to prerequisite skills needed for Tier 1 success.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Plan collaboratively in PLCs using explicit instruction routines (I Do, We Do, You Do) for Tier 1 instruction and implement aligned intervention support.
• Provide frequent opportunities for explicit instruction daily, including modeling, guided practice with specific feedback, and independent practice.
*Keep instructional routines and expectations clear and consistent across classrooms and support settings.
• Provide additional support matched to the learner's needs and monitor the learner's response to CFUs, scaffolds, and interventions.
*Pull small math intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

Action Step #3
Quarter 3:

Person Monitoring:
Michelle Hume, Math Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

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

• Identify instructional gaps through walkthrough and analysis data trends.
• Ensure interventions are aligned to the content being taught in core instruction.
• Highlight and strengthen high-impact instructional practices by identifying classrooms effectively using explicit instruction and opportunities for peer observation to share those practices.
* Review data, reflect, and adjust scheduled items with support facilitator involvement with walk-throughs, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring as needed.
Math Coach(T) Actions:
• Continue to model strong explicit instruction in both whole group and small group settings (clear modeling, guided practice with specific feedback).
• Differentiate coaching cycles based on teacher/student performance data.
*Support teachers to improve lesson delivery—especially pacing, modeling, and guided practice with specific feedback.
• Coach teachers to use student data during instruction to make real-time adjustments and respond to students' needs.
• Lead PLC conversations on how explicit instruction is impacting student mastery of standards. Identify trends – strengths and weaknesses and create a plan to reteach as needed.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Use exit tickets, quick checks, and quizzes to identify specific skill gaps, then adjust the next lesson (Tier 1, reteach, or enrichment) to target those needs.
• Strengthen modeling by breaking skills into clear steps to show the thinking process, and guiding students through practice before independent work.
• Follow the curriculum closely to ensure Tier 1 and intervention teach the same skills with consistent language, pacing, and routines.
• Collaborate regularly across Gen Ed, and ESE teams to ensure consistent routines, expectations, and instructional practices across all learning settings.
*Pull small math intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

Action Step #4
Quarter 4:

Person Monitoring:
Michelle Hume, Math Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Review achievement data and walkthroughs to see how well Tier 1 and intervention are working together.
• When data shows students are not making expected gains, put extra supports in place (reteach blocks, added intervention time, "all hands-on deck" scheduling, focused small groups).
• Focus support on bubble students and students close to proficiency to maximize learning gains.
* Review data and reflect on scheduled items with support facilitator involvement including walk-throughs, SWD planning structures, and progress monitoring as needed.
Math Coach(T) Actions:
• Help teams analyze data to identify students not yet making progress and specific skill gaps.
• Support planning for reteach, enrichment, and small-group intervention based on student needs.
• Model and support "all hands-on deck" response strategies (targeted groups, flexible grouping, intensive reteach cycles).
• Share strong examples of effective Tier 1 and intervention instruction tied to student growth.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Review student data to identify who needs to reteach, enrichment, or extra support.

• Adjust instruction quickly when students are not mastering skills (reteach in Tier 1 or intervention groups).
• Focus instruction on bubble students to help move them to proficiency and increase learning gains.
• Use flexible grouping and collaborate across teams to provide extra support when needed.
*Pull small math intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

Area of Focus #3

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Black/African American Students (BLK)

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.

Black/Af. Am. ESSA subgroup continues to score below the 41% Federal Index. In 24-25 this ESSA subgroups was at 27%, though for the 25-26 school year this increased to 35%, an increase of 8%, this subgroup continues to score the lowest of any subgroup and continue to fall below the 41%.

The data indicates a need to strengthen literacy and math instruction, to improve overall ELA and Math achievement, closing gaps of Black/African American Students.

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.

In 2027, the overall Federal Percent of Points for blacks will be at or above 41%, an increase from 35%.

Monitoring

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

• Data Analysis: Analyze student work and assessment data after collaborative planning cycles to determine whether instructional adjustments are improving student outcomes.

• Quarterly Monitoring: Revisit data each quarter and adjust action steps as needed.

• Walkthrough Alignment: Conduct classroom walkthroughs in Tier 1 core classrooms and Tier 2 support to look for evidence that agreed-upon content and instructional practices from collaborative planning are visible in instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Christine Boyd, Principal, Lauren Edwards-Hollis, AP

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:
Explicit Instruction and Teacher Clarity: This is an evidence-based and structured approach where teachers model and explain skills, guide practice, and gradually release responsibility (I Do, We Do, You Do), with sequenced instruction, frequent checks for understanding, IEP and/or intervention alignment, feedback, and practice opportunities. Teacher clarity ensures students understand what they are learning, why it matters, and how success will be measured.

Rationale:
Explicit Instruction and Teacher Clarity will improve comprehension, mastery, and retention of content while addressing learning gaps. Effective implementation requires collaborative planning, aligned outcomes across all teachers (gen ed, ESE), IEP alignment, and a student-centered environment which will create coherence for learners.

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
Quarter 1:

Person Monitoring:
Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Establish a master schedule that protects weekly common collaborative planning time for content teachers and support facilitators.
* Conduct professional learning with Literacy Coach on delivering explicit instruction of standards-aligned district-adopted curriculum including planning lessons that include clear modeling, guided practice with feedback, and checks for understanding (CFUs).
• Develop and implement instructional non-negotiables for teacher clarity (e.g., posted learning intentions and success criteria, daily modeling, guided practice, checks for understanding, and student discourse expectations). By QUARTER and By ROLE Include Baseline and tie to Strategic Plan Goal
* Define expectations and create schedule for support facilitator participation in Tier 1 planning, instructional delivery, and data review.

* Set expectation for use of standards-aligned curriculum materials across Tier 1 and intervention as the first source for instruction.
* Plan and communicate a system for monitoring to include calendar for classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning calendar, and coaching cycle calendar.
* Create and/or calibrate walkthrough tool with leadership team.
*Collaborate monthly with additional teams; counselor, social worker, ESE Support Specialist to ensure students are being properly serviced and supported in all areas.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Facilitate professional learning on explicit instruction and clarity when delivering instruction on standards-aligned implementation of Benchmark Advance curriculum.
• Model lessons demonstrating instructional non-negotiables with standards-aligned curriculum.
• Support teachers in planning standards-aligned lessons that include clear modeling, guided practice, and checks for understanding (CFUs).
• Conduct coaching cycles focused on strengthening standards alignment, lesson structure, gradual release, and checks for understanding.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Collaboratively plan standards-aligned learning intentions and success criteria using ELA and Math curriculum and district guides.
• Implement instructional non-negotiables daily (modeling, guided practice with feedback, independent practice, CFUs).
• Participate in coaching cycles and apply feedback to instruction.
* Monitor student attendance, as well as conduct parent/teacher conferences as needed.
*Pull small ELA intervention groups based on BPS decision tree and student gaps by Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T).

Action Step #2
Quarter 2:

Person Monitoring:
Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Monitor PLC implementation monthly to ensure Tier 1 and intervention teachers collaboratively plan around grade-level standards and prerequisite skills.
• Conduct weekly walkthroughs using a common look-for tool aligned to instructional non negotiables and provide actionable feedback to teachers, support facilitators and coaches. • Run structured data meetings where teachers look at student data together and figure out how what students are learning in core instruction (Tier 1) connects to and guide the extra help they get in intervention
• Provide PD on how to use student data to move students between Tier 1 and intervention more effectively. Example: Deep dive and edit into BPS slide deck, student exit tickets/mini assessments, determine what level of support students need.
*Collaborate monthly with additional teams; counselor, social worker, ESE Support Specialist to ensure students are being properly serviced and supported in all areas.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Lead PLCs in analyzing student work/data to identify standards-based misconceptions and needed scaffolds.
• Continue coaching cycles with targeted feedback on implementation of explicit instruction, clarity and standards-based lesson delivery.
• Model explicit instruction (clear modeling, think-alouds, guided practice, and gradual release) during small-group and whole-group lessons.

• Support teachers in aligning intervention support to prerequisite skills needed for Tier 1 success.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Plan together in PLCs using explicit instruction routines (I Do, We Do, You Do) for Tier 1 instruction and how will implementation be strengthened each quarter? aligned intervention support.
• Use explicit instruction daily, including modeling, guided practice, and independent practice.
*Keep instructional routines and expectations consistent across classrooms and support settings.
• Adjust instruction based on student data, using CFUs to guide next steps.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
*Collaborate with ESE support specialist, Interventionists, MTSS Coordinator, and programming specialist to find tune our structured classroom and gather input as to any changes and revisions needed to student's educational plan.
* Monitor student attendance, as well as conduct parent/teacher conferences as needed.

Action Step #3
Quarter 3:

Person Monitoring:
Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Identify instructional gaps using walkthrough and data trends.
• Inspect intervention for connections directly to what students are learning in Tier 1
• Highlight and level-up high-impact instructional practices. Spot strong classrooms using explicit instruction well and share those practices via peer observations.
*Collaborate monthly with additional teams; counselor, social worker, ESE Support Specialist to ensure students are being properly serviced and supported in all areas.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Continue to model strong explicit instruction in both whole group and small group settings (clear modeling, think-alouds, guided practice).
• Differentiate coaching cycles based on teacher/student performance data. Help teachers improve lesson delivery—especially pacing, modeling, and guided practice.
• Coach teachers on using student data during lessons to adjust instruction in the moment. • Lead PLC conversations on how explicit instruction is impacting student mastery of standards. Identify trends – strengths and weaknesses and create a plan for to reteach as needed.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Use exit tickets, quick checks, and quizzes to identify specific skill gaps, then adjust the next lesson (Tier 1, reteach, or enrichment) to target those needs.
• Strengthen modeling by breaking skills into clear steps, using think-alouds to show the thinking process, and guiding students through practice before independent work.
• Follow curriculum closely to ensure Tier 1 and intervention teach the same skills with consistent language, pacing, and routines.
* Monitor student attendance, as well as conduct parent/teacher conferences as needed.

Action Step #4
Quarter 4:

Person Monitoring:
Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

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

• Review achievement data and walkthroughs to see how well Tier 1 and intervention are working together.
• When data shows students are not making expected gains, put extra supports in place (reteach blocks, added intervention time, “all hands on deck” scheduling, focused small groups).
• Focus support on bubble students and students close to proficiency to maximize learning gains.
*Collaborate monthly with additional teams; counselor, social worker, ESE Support Specialist to ensure students are being properly serviced and supported in all areas.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Help teams analyze data to identify students not yet making progress and specific skill gaps.
• Support planning for reteach, enrichment, and small-group intervention based on student needs.
• Model and support “all hands on deck” response strategies (targeted groups, flexible grouping, intensive reteach cycles).
• Share strong examples of effective Tier 1 and intervention instruction tied to student growth.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Review student data to identify who needs to reteach, enrichment, or extra support.
*Update IEP goals, aligned with Tier I instruction and grade-level materials at Annual IEPs.
• Adjust instruction quickly when students are not mastering skills (reteach in Tier 1 or intervention groups).
• Focus instruction on bubble students to help move them to proficiency and increase learning gains.
• Use flexible grouping and collaborate across teams to provide extra support when needed.
*Reflect on new procedures implemented within structured classroom setting, ESE supports, MTSS process, etc. to determine what worked well and what needs improvement for student success.
* Monitor student attendance, as well as conduct parent/teacher conferences as needed.

Area of Focus #4

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

For the 25-26 school year, the ELA proficiency in 2nd grade was 45%. This is below the state average of 53% and the district average of 59%. 2nd grade did not meet HCES School Improvement Goal of 50% this past year to exit RAISE status.

The data indicates a need to strengthen literacy instruction, to improve overall ELA achievement and close gaps with state and district performance.

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.

In 2027, the percent of 2nd grade students proficient (3+) on the ELA assessment will increase from 45% to 50%.

Monitoring

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

• Data Analysis: Analyze student work and assessment data after collaborative planning cycles to determine whether instructional adjustments are improving student outcomes.

• Quarterly Monitoring: Revisit data each quarter and adjust action steps as needed.

• Walkthrough Alignment: Conduct classroom walkthroughs in Tier 1 core classrooms and Tier 2 support to look for evidence that agreed-upon content and instructional practices from collaborative planning are visible in instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Explicit Instruction and Teacher Clarity: This is an evidence-based and structured approach where teachers model and explain skills, guide practice, and gradually release responsibility (I Do, We Do, You Do), with sequenced instruction, frequent checks for understanding, feedback, and practice opportunities. Teacher clarity ensures students understand what they are learning, why it matters, and how success will be measured.

Rationale:

Explicit Instruction and Teacher Clarity will improve comprehension, mastery, and retention of content while addressing learning gaps. Effective implementation requires collaborative planning, aligned outcomes across all teachers (gen ed, ESE), and a student-centered environment which will create coherence for learners.

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
Quarter 1:

Person Monitoring:
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Establish a master schedule that protects weekly common collaborative planning time for content teachers and support facilitators.
* Conduct professional learning with Literacy Coach on delivering explicit instruction of standards-aligned district-adopted curriculum including: planning lessons that include clear modeling, guided practice with feedback, and checks for understanding (CFUs).
• Develop and implement instructional non-negotiables for teacher clarity (e.g., posted learning intentions and success criteria, daily modeling, guided practice, checks for understanding, and student discourse expectations). By QUARTER and By ROLE Include Baseline and tie to Strategic Plan Goal
* Define expectations and create schedule for support facilitator participation in Tier 1 planning, instructional delivery, and data review.
* Set expectation for use of standards-aligned curriculum materials across Tier 1 and intervention as the first source for instruction.
* Plan and communicate a system for monitoring to include: calendar for classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning calendar, and coaching cycle calendar.
* Create and/or calibrate walkthrough tool with leadership team.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Facilitate professional learning on explicit instruction and clarity when delivering instruction on standards-aligned implementation of Benchmark Advance curriculum and UFLI.
• Model lessons demonstrating instructional non-negotiables with standards-aligned curriculum.
• Support teachers in planning standards-aligned lessons that include clear modeling, guided practice, and checks for understanding (CFUs).
• Conduct coaching cycles focused on strengthening standards alignment, lesson structure, gradual release, and checks for understanding.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Collaboratively plan standards-aligned learning intentions and success criteria using Benchmark Advance curriculum and district guides.
• Implement instructional non-negotiables daily (modeling, guided practice with feedback, independent practice, CFUs).
• Participate in coaching cycles and apply feedback to instruction.

Action Step #2
Quarter 2:

Person Monitoring:
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

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

• Monitor PLC implementation monthly to ensure Tier 1 and intervention teachers collaboratively plan around grade-level standards and prerequisite skills.
• Conduct weekly walkthroughs using a common look-for tool aligned to instructional non negotiables and provide actionable feedback to teachers, support facilitators and coaches.
• Run structured data meetings where teachers look at student data together and figure out how what students are learning in core instruction (Tier 1) connects to and guide the extra help they get in intervention
• Provide PD on how to use student data to move students between Tier 1 and intervention more effectively. Example: Deep dive and edit into BPS slide deck, student exit tickets/mini assessments, determine what level of support students need.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Lead PLCs in analyzing student work/data to identify standards-based misconceptions and needed scaffolds.
• Continue coaching cycles with targeted feedback on implementation of explicit instruction, clarity and standards-based lesson delivery.
• Model explicit instruction (clear modeling, think-alouds, guided practice, and gradual release) during small-group and Teir 1.
Support teachers in aligning intervention support to prerequisite skills needed for Tier 1 success.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Plan together in PLCs using explicit instruction routines (I Do, We Do, You Do) for Tier 1 instruction and aligned intervention support.
• Use explicit instruction daily, including modeling, guided practice, and independent practice.
*Keep instructional routines and expectations consistent across classrooms and support settings.
• Adjust instruction based on student data, using CFUs to guide next steps.

Action Step #3
Quarter 3:

Person Monitoring:
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Identify instructional gaps using walkthrough and data trends.
• Inspect intervention for connections directly to what students are learning in Tier 1
• Highlight and level-up high-impact instructional practices. Spot strong classrooms using explicit instruction well and share those practices via peer observations.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Continue to model strong explicit instruction in both whole group and small group settings (clear modeling, think-alouds, guided practice).
• Differentiate coaching cycles based on teacher/student performance data. Help teachers improve lesson delivery—especially pacing, modeling, and guided practice.
• Coach teachers on using student data during lessons to adjust instruction in the moment.
• Lead PLC conversations on how explicit instruction is impacting student mastery of standards. Identify trends – strengths and weaknesses and create a plan for to reteach as needed.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Use exit tickets, quick checks, and quizzes to identify specific skill gaps, then adjust the next lesson (Tier 1, reteach, or enrichment) to target those needs.
• Strengthen modeling by breaking skills into clear steps, using think-alouds to show the thinking process, and guiding students through practice before independent work.
• Follow curriculum closely to ensure Tier 1 and intervention teach the same skills with consistent

language, pacing, and routines.
• Collaborate regularly across Gen Ed, ESE, and ELL teams to ensure consistent routines, expectations, and instructional practices across all learning settings.

Action Step #4
Quarter 4:

Person Monitoring:
Emily Davis, Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Review achievement data and walkthroughs to see how well Tier 1 and intervention are working together.
• When data shows students are not making expected gains, put extra supports in place (reteach blocks, added intervention time, “all hands on deck” scheduling, focused small groups).
• Focus support on bubble students and students close to proficiency to maximize learning gains.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Help teams analyze data to identify students not yet making progress and specific skill gaps.
• Support planning for reteach, enrichment, and small-group intervention based on student needs.
• Model and support “all hands on deck” response strategies (targeted groups, flexible grouping, intensive reteach cycles).
• Share strong examples of effective Tier 1 and intervention instruction tied to student growth.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE):
• Review student data to identify who needs to reteach, enrichment, or extra support.
• Adjust instruction quickly when students are not mastering skills (reteach in Tier 1 or intervention groups).
• Focus instruction on bubble students to help move them to proficiency and increase learning gains.
• Use flexible grouping and collaborate across teams to provide extra support when needed.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

For the 25-26 school year, HCES’s overall Average Daily Attendance was 93%. Though this is an increase from the 24-25 school year, 6th grade has the lowest ADA, below the school average, at 90.7%.

This data indicates a need to strengthen a positive learning environment, in 6th grade, to improve the overall 6th grade ADA, directly effecting academic achievement.

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.

In 2027, the Average Daily Attendance for 6th grade will increase from 90.7% to 92%.

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.

Data Analysis: Analyze Average Attendance Daily reports and Chronic Absenteeism for 6th grade.

Quarterly Monitoring: Revisit monthly data from ADA reports.

Alignment: Adjust actions steps and supports as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Christine Boyd, Principal Lauren Edwards-Hollis, AP

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:

Average daily attendance will improve and chronic absenteeism will decrease through: • Proactive monitoring • Family engagement • Positive school culture • Targeted interventions for students with chronic absenteeism • Teach and reinforce resiliency traits (self-management, responsibility, perseverance) through Xello, classroom instruction, and PBIS

Rationale:

These strategies help identify concerns early, address barriers to attendance, and build stronger connections between students, families, and the school to reduce chronic absenteeism.

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
Quarter 1:

Person Monitoring:
Michelle Martinez, Guidance

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Team (School Counselor, Social Worker, Principal, Asst. Principal) Actions:
• Review student attendance data monthly to identify trends and at-risk students.
• Establish attendance tracking system and early warning list (5+ absences flag).
• Launch resiliency instruction (self-management, responsibility) through Xello lessons, classroom routines, and PBIS
• Implement daily morning announcements reinforcing expectations and school culture.
• Develop and launch attendance incentive system for classrooms and individual students with perfect attendance (monthly and
quarterly recognition).
• Plan family engagement nights (K–6 math/STEM/science nights) to strengthen school-home connection.
• Assign Certified School Counselor to activity wheel to support character and resiliency instruction.
• Data-Driven Reflection and Targeted Interventions1: Utilize PowerBI dashboards and reflection templates in data meetings to guide
decisions. Develop individualized behavior plans for students with five or more referrals through collaboration between teachers,
administration, and the Teacher on Assignment.
• Staff Recognition and Culture Building: Celebrate staff regularly with “Fill My Reward Bucket” shout-outs and host social events
each nine weeks to build a positive school culture.
Teacher Actions:
• Greet students at the door daily and implement Morning Meetings to build relationships and classroom community.
• Co-create classroom expectations with students.
• Teach and reinforce resiliency traits during lessons, discussions, and daily routines
• Begin proactive family communication using planners (3–6) and communication folders (K–3).
• Monitor homeroom students' attendance. When a student has missed 3 days of unexcused absences in a nine-week period, the
teacher will call home and document in Focus

Action Step #2
Quarter 2:

Person Monitoring:
Michelle Martinez

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Monitor attendance trends and evaluate effectiveness of supports and incentives.
• Conduct parent meetings for students with 5+ absences.
• Implement targeted interventions (Check & Connect, mentoring, small groups).
• Reinforce perseverance and responsibility through small groups, mentoring, and classroom

discussions.
• Launch and support a mentor-based attendance (Check and Connect) program with the counselor and social worker, providing
targeted interventions for students not responding to initial supports.
Teacher Actions:
• Continue door greetings, and relationship-building routines.
• Maintain consistent use of schoolwide expectations and language.
• Strengthen family communication regarding attendance and behavior concerns and document in FOCUS.
• Continue monitoring attendance and completing required family contacts after 3 unexcused absences.
• Support attendance incentives and reinforce recognition systems in the classroom.

Action Step #3
Quarter 3:

Person Monitoring:
Michelle Martinez

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Intensify interventions for students with 5+ absences through targeted attendance plans and family conferences.
• Adjust instruction based on data and reteach self-management and perseverance
• Expand individualized behavior and attendance support plans for students not responding to initial interventions.
• Adjust incentive systems to re-engage students showing declining attendance.
Teacher Actions:
• Reteach behavior/attendance expectations at start of new year.
• Increase outreach to families of students with ongoing attendance concerns and maintain required documentation and
communication.
• Continue consistent classroom culture and engagement strategies while reinforcing attendance goals and celebrating student
progress.
• Support, monitor, and participate in individualized student intervention plans.

Action Step #4
Quarter 4:

Person Monitoring:
Michelle Martinez

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Team Actions
• Evaluate attendance trends and effectiveness of interventions.
• Keep support systems in place for students still struggling with attendance.
• Celebrate attendance growth and use the data to plan improvements for next year, including transition planning for at-risk
students.
• Review impact of resiliency instruction and plan for next year
Teacher Actions

• Keep strong classroom routines and engagement strategies going through the end of the year.
• Encourage attendance and support final incentive and celebration efforts.
• Take part in discussions about student progress and planning for students who still need support next year.

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.

The approved SIP is shared with stakeholders through multiple outlets. Our SIP is shared with families through our Title One Annual Meeting and sent to all families through our FOCUS communication app. The SIP is shared on our school website for all stakeholders to access at https://harborcity.brevardschools.org/. We offer the ability to translate the SIP into the stakeholder's home language upon request. The approved SIP is shared with faculty and staff during a faculty meeting and email. It is also shared with stakeholders during our SAC meeting. Progress towards our SIP goals is reviewed after each progress monitoring assessment window (PM2 and PM3) and is shared with stakeholders during faculty meetings, SAC Meetings, and with families through our FOCUS app.

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)).

Our school is dedicated to fostering strong, positive relationships with families, parents, and community members. To achieve this goal, we have developed a Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) in collaboration with our families and community members. Summaries of our school's PFEP are shared with our stakeholders on our school website https://harborcity.brevardschools.org/ and shared in our weekly newsletter. This plan is translated into family's home languages based on our

home language report. The PFEP highlights how our school plans to build positive relationships with all stakeholders to support the needs of our students. This included hosting family engagement events with a focus on strategies to support learning at home, two-way communication, translation opportunities, and methods for keeping families informed of student progress throughout the school year.

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)).

To strengthen our school's academic program, we are implementing a multi-faceted approach that focuses on increasing student engagement, improving instructional practices, and building staff collective efficacy in all core subect areas. To increase student engagement, we plan to focus on Tier I instruction, increasing explcit instruction through collaborative planning and cohearance. To improve instrucational practices, we will collaboratively plan, look at data, adjust intervetnion groups, discuss high quality instructional strategies one day each week for ELA and one day each week for Math. We will conduct intervention groups in both subject areas with fidelity. Attendance will be closely monitored, supports for families offered, and incentives will be put in place to increase daily attendance and decreased chronic truancy. Our ESSA group, black/Af. Am. students will be closely monitored to ensure the supports, interventions, and explicit Tier I instruction are meeting their needs. These steps will be adjusted, if needed, after the testing period (PM2). We will use our Title One Teacher (T) and 2 Paraprofessionals (T) to support interventions and grade level blocks in ELA and Math. Resources, supplies, and materials (T) will be used for Famliy Engagement Events and some purchased for academic support at home. Two "Parent" monthly newsletters (T) will be purchased and sent home discussing way to communicate and best support your child at home. An online newsletter service (T), that offers translation services and will be used for weekly communciation, with families, from the leadership team.

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)).

Our School Improvement Plan is a comprehensive plan that utilizes federal, state, and local services, resources, and programs collaboratively to ensure all students can meet challenging state standards. Student Services and Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS) provide

instructional support services to students, families, and teachers of students with exceptionalities. Title IX/McKinney Vento provides support and services like school supplies, tutoring, counseling, and transportation for our families in transition. Title III provides instructional support for our ELL students and translation opportunities for families. Through Title II, professional development and training is provided for our staff to improve instructional practices. In collaboration with the Early Learning Coalition of Brevard, we host a Voluntary Prekindergarten Program at our elementary school. Our VPK program is a free early learning program to prepare four-year olds for kindergarten and build the foundation for school success.

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)).

Our school has a variety of services designed to help students, parents, and teachers develop positive learning experiences. Students have access to a school counselor and social worker. These professionals can assist students in addressing challenges, fostering resilience, managing emotions, and applying interpersonal skills in both individual and group settings. Basic care needs are also addressed. Mentors are available for students assigned by campus staff, district mentors and community mentor volunteers. Resiliency education is built into our school environment through our daily morning meetings. Our Resiliency program focuses on character development, and mental health. Consultations are available to parents and teachers to include information on referral services in the community with the goal that families have the resources and support needed to address the overall mental wellness of our students.

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)).

N/A

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)).

At ABC HCES, the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) system is in place. This evidence-based model uses data-based problem solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. The instruction and intervention are delivered to all students in varying intensities (tiers) based on student need. Need driven decision-making ensures that support and resources reach the

appropriate students at the level needed to accelerate student performance and reach proficiency. *We meet with each grade level, discuss Tiered supports and move through the MTSS process as needed. As a PBIS school we support being Safe, Responsible, and Respectful, allowing students to each tokens for incentives.*

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)).

Teacher retention increases when they have access to professional learning opportunities and support that are aligned with their needs, interests, and goals. Teachers will participate in monthly professional learning communities (PLC). During these PLC meetings, job-embedded professional learning will be provided that is focused on data analysis and instructional strategies. Professional development focused on teacher clarity will occur during preplanning and in weekly grade level meetings. New teachers will participate in the New Teacher Academy and be supported by a mentor in the same grade level or content area. Struggling teachers will also have the opportunity to work with a school or district-based mentor. After each performance monitoring tool, teachers will review data and plan instruction supported by instructional coaches (T) and the Title One (T) Team. Our instructional coaches (T) will provide job-embedded professional learning through coaching cycles. Paraprofessionals (T) will work under the supervision and guidance of certified teachers.

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)).

To aid in the transition from early childhood education program to Harbor City Elementary School, we offer a Kindergarten orientation. During this orientation, families can experience some of the learning activities in kindergarten. Families, with their children, are encouraged to tour the school, participate in kindergarten centers, and speak with key school personnel. We also offer a soft start for our incoming Kindergarteners where students can come in and be assessed by the classroom teacher. This gives students and parents the opportunity to preview the classroom before the first day of school, increase comfort levels and support a successful start in elementary school.

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.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment: Administration and CNA team analyzed data during the summer and created plans based on identified areas of need. The team began by conducting a needs assessment to identify the specific challenges faced by the students, such as academic gaps, and attendance issues.

Resource Evaluation: The Title One and CNA team examined the current allocation and utilization of resources, including Title One teaching staff, technology, instructional materials, support services, and funding. The team evaluated whether these resources were effectively addressing the identified needs and if they aligned with the school's goals.

Gap Analysis: The team compared existing resources and impact on student achievement against identified needs. The team identified gaps that were underutilized or lacking. This included teacher resources, staffing, and professional learning.

Action Plan Developed: Administration identified areas of focus based on multiple data sources. Once determined, appropriate research-based interventions were determined.

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).

Title One Teacher and 2 paraprofessionals (T)-Oversee and implement trageted interventions in ELA and Math
Math Coach (T)-Plan and facilitate weekly collaborative planning, in math, with all teachers, focusing on explicit instruction.
Staff Development Consultant (T)-Inspirational Educational Speaker to motivate and energize all staff, focusing on student achievement and potential
Printing, materials, and supplies to support Family Engagement Nights and Instruction (T)
Parent Involvement Materials to take home for home-school connection and to increase student achievement (T)
Subscriptions to Parenting Newsletter and online newsletter to communicate with families and offer ideas/supports for at home (T)

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. **Yes**

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