Brevard Public Schools

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND ELEMENTARY



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 36

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 39

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 42

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 43

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on Approved by School Board on Sept. 10, 2026. .

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

To help all students develop skills, concepts, attitudes, and values that enable them to be successful members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement

Looking toward our children's future with challenging learning experiences that will lead to success.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Samantha Alison

Alison.samantha@brevardschools.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

As the principal, Mrs. Alison is responsible for effectively interpreting student data and communicating the strengths and areas of improvement to the Holland Elementary stakeholders. She is an active member of the School Advisory Council and collaborates with the council in discussions and decisions to support the continual improvement of Holland Elementary. She effectively communicates the school improvement goals and the actions required for implementation. Throughout the school year, she monitors the implementation of the School Improvement Plan to ensure that it is being done with fidelity and that it is a living, breathing document that can be adjusted to meet the changing needs of our school. Mrs. Alison also facilitates MTSS Monday Meetings, Leadership Team Meetings,

and Data Team Meetings to lead the monitoring of student progress. She actively acquires materials and resources for teachers to support their curriculum and instruction. She builds systems to retain an outstanding workforce in order to provide the best possible culture for teaching and learning.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name
Kimberly Walling

walling.kimberly@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Ms. Walling coordinates all aspects of the curriculum. She assists teachers in interpreting and implementing district-approved curriculum and corresponding implementation guides and resources. Ms. Walling observes teachers and provides feedback on how to implement standards-aligned, rigorous instruction. Additionally, she makes sure that teachers have the necessary resources to provide quality instruction to their students. She is the MTSS Facilitator and leads the MTSS Leadership Team ensuring that all students receive Tier II and III interventions as needed. She leads Data Team Meetings and collaborates routinely with the school counselor and literacy coach in this effort. Ms. Walling is the Chair of the SBTMT (School-Based Threat Management Team) and addresses student discipline, supporting a positive, safe learning environment allowing student learning to be priority.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Audra Myer

Myer.Audra@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Ms. Myer monitors the implementation of the BEST ELA Standards and the Benchmark Advance and SAVVAS Programs. She mentors new classroom teachers through lesson modeling, lesson plan design, lesson structures, and facilitation of peer observations. She also serves as the Lead Mentor, completing coaching cycles with teachers as needed. Ms. Myer's supports and delivers ELA professional development, monitors the fidelity of i-Ready usage, pass rates, and data for progress monitoring, leads the i-Ready school-wide incentive program, and is the Co-Chair of the Literacy

Leadership Team. Ms. Myer helps plan and monitor Tier II and Tier III interventions, is an active member of the MTSS Leadership Team as the Academic Intervention Point of Contact, assists leading Data Team Meetings, and is a member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Alina Burns

Alina.Burns@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Guidance Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mrs. Burns, Holland's Guidance Counselor, supports students and teachers in ensuring a safe and supportive learning environment. She is a member of the MTSS Leadership Team, serving as the Behavior Intervention Point of Contact, supporting the MTSS process. She is also the ESE and PST coordinator, managing meeting schedules and necessary documentation. She assists teachers with documenting student needs and implementing Behavioral Intervention Plans to address students' Tier II and III behavioral needs. Mrs. Burns counsels students on a regular basis in relation to their IEPs, SSMPs, and/or BIPs. She leads the charge when it comes to student welfare to include Youth Mental Health First Aid, overseeing the SRI process, is co-chair of the School Based Threat Management Team (SBTMT), and oversees the school’s anti-bullying program. Mrs. Burns provides students with the stability and support they need to focus on academic achievement.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

Describe the process for involving stakeholders [including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders] and how their input was used in the SIP development process (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process for involving stakeholders is done through various means. All school stakeholders are surveyed annually to include students, families, and staff members. Data from those surveys inform the School Improvement Plan Areas of Focus, Action Steps, and Goals. The school leadership team meets weekly to discuss schoolwide initiatives based on the current SIP, and a minimum of once per month, the team assesses progress toward addressing the Areas of Focus within the School

Improvement Plan (SIP). Teachers meet with administration and/or the MTSS team at data meetings and faculty meetings. These meetings focus on schoolwide student performance/proficiency data, the lowest 25% in student performance in reading and/or math, SIP action steps, and student behavioral needs. Teachers meet with the MTSS leadership team individually twice annually after PM1 and PM2 to review their students' performance data and goals to address areas of deficiency. Throughout the school year, the School Advisory Council (SAC) is advised of the progress of the SIP and their input is gathered based on schoolwide student performance data and initiatives. At the first SAC meeting, stakeholders are asked for their input regarding the development of this year's SIP based on student data and the areas of focus from the prior year's SIP. Then throughout the school year, faculty/staff and the SAC committee provide input and feedback based on student performance data and schoolwide initiatives. The BPIE (School Best Practices for Inclusive Education Assessment) is completed by a diverse team of stakeholders to assess Holland's implementation of required indicators related to students with disabilities.

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 School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be regularly monitored for effective implementation through classroom walkthroughs, grade level data meetings, teacher conferencing/feedback, and professional development. The SIP will be reviewed monthly with all stakeholders with updates regarding the implementation of the SIP Areas of Focus and Action Steps. Members will be asked for their input for effectiveness of implemntation based on student performance data from FAST and i-Ready. Adjustments will be made to the SIP based on the progress monitoring of student performance data.

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	**30.7%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**NO**
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	**N/A**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)** **BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)** **HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)** **MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)** **WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)** **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)**
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY **2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.*	**2025-26: A** **2024-25: A** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: A** **2021-22: A**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

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	41	51	59	77	58	68	74	0	0	428
Absent 10% or more school days	4	2	8	7	5	9	6	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	1	4	2	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Current Year 2026-27

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

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

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	2	2		1						5
Students retained two or more times										0

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	50	60	70	51	64	68	62			425
Absent 10% or more school days	1	12	6	2	6	6	9			42
One or more suspensions	1	1	5	5	3	4	9			28
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)					1		3			4
Course failure in Math						1	5			6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	4	11	2	1	5	7			32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	2	6	4	1	1	5	5			24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (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	1	1	3		2	4	5			16

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	5			1		4			13
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

Data for 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*	81	65	62	79	62	59	78	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	96	63	61	80	58	59	75	59	58
ELA Learning Gains	65	67	63	75	62	60	70	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59	61	58	58	57	56	55	60	57
Math Achievement*	89	66	66	84	63	64	80	62	62
Math Learning Gains	82	68	64	89	67	63	79	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66	55	50	74	54	51	63	59	52
Science Achievement	78	66	62	78	62	58	82	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)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	77%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	616
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	98%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
77%	77%	73%	82%	80%	73%	

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	53%	No		
Black/African American Students	85%	No		
Hispanic Students	75%	No		
Multiracial Students	81%	No		
White Students	77%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	69%	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	81%	96%	65%	59%	89%	82%	66%	78%					
Students With Disabilities	55%		50%	36%	66%	71%	48%	45%					
Black/African American Students	80%				90%								
Hispanic Students	78%		63%		89%	68%							
Multiracial Students	77%		85%		86%	77%							
White Students	82%	93%	61%	56%	89%	83%	68%	81%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	86%	49%	43%	86%	77%	71%	71%					

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	79%	80%	75%	58%	84%	89%	74%	78%					
Students With Disabilities	52%	62%	56%	36%	62%	75%	60%	60%					
Black/African American Students	73%				82%								
Hispanic Students	74%	60%	75%		81%	88%							
Multiracial Students	84%		79%		89%	100%							
White Students	79%	83%	75%	64%	84%	88%	74%	79%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	75%	79%	67%	76%	83%	67%	65%					

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	78%	75%	70%	55%	80%	79%	63%	82%					
Students With Disabilities	52%	61%	51%	47%	53%	56%	42%	46%					
Hispanic Students	63%		61%		74%	78%							
Multiracial Students	67%				80%								
White Students	81%	75%	72%	48%	80%	80%	55%	84%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	67%	61%	55%	45%	69%	71%	61%	69%					

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	87%	63%	24%	60%	27%
ELA	4	85%	61%	24%	60%	25%
ELA	5	69%	62%	7%	61%	8%
ELA	6	80%	74%	6%	62%	18%
Math	3	94%	66%	28%	66%	28%
Math	4	90%	62%	28%	65%	25%
Math	5	80%	58%	22%	62%	18%
Math	6	91%	74%	17%	60%	31%
Science	5	76%	64%	12%	60%	16%

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?

Third-grade ELA has steadily improved since 2024, when students scored at 75% proficiency. This area showed the most improvement out of all school grade components increasing from 80% in 2025 to 96% proficiency in 2026. Adjustments were made to instructional staff in the grade level, resulting in a cohesive, aligned, and highly effective team with an exemplary teacher leaders, who prioritized explicit instruction and bell-to-bell learning. We also incorporated strong collaborative planning sessions, grouped students by ability levels one day per week, and had small-group collaborative push-in sessions with the Literacy Coach, in addition to the ESE Resource Teacher, multiple times per week.

Lowest Performance

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

Although it has steadily increased from 55% in 2024 to 58% in 2025, and now 59% in 2026, ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% showed the lowest performance. Data indicates that in the bottom quartile, only 50% of 5th graders and 58% of 6th graders made an annual learning gain in ELA, which accounts for two-thirds of that component. Contributing factors are the large number of students with disabilities who struggle in the area of reading in the grade level. Several adjustments have been planned for 26-27 to improve performance, to include strengthened/increased direct, explicit instruction and weekly assigned Standards Mastery i-Ready lessons to close gaps, in addition to schedule changes, bellwork updates, and tightening of behavioral expectations. ESE students will receive their services during the ELA block in a collaborative teaching model.

Greatest Decline

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

Learning Gains in ELA had increased from 70% in 2024 to 75% in 2025, but showed the greatest decline this year, decreasing 10 points to 65%. Data indicates that only 57% of students in 5th Grade and 62% of students in 6th grade made an annual learning gain in ELA,

which again accounts for two-thirds of that component. The same adjustments listed above are planned to be made to improve this performance, in addition to strengthening the challenging instruction for our top 25% in order to ensure our top-performing students continue to excel and make a year's worth of progress.

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.

NA

EWS Areas of Concern

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

A total of 10 students in 5th and 6th grades scored at Level 1 in ELA, representing 7% of 5th graders and 9% of 6th graders, respectively.

Highest Priorities

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

- **Learning Gains ELA**
- **Learning Gains ELA for the Lowest 25%**
- **Learning Gains Mathematics**
- **Learning Gains Mathematics for the Lowest 25%**
- **Science Proficiency**

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.

ELA Learning Gains in Grades 5 and 6 have declined, resulting in a decline in the ELA Learning Gains component, from 75% in 2025 to 65% in 2026. Although ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% increased, this area showed the lowest performance. Data indicates that in the bottom quartile, only 50% of 5th graders and 58% of 6th graders made an annual learning gain in ELA, which accounts for two-thirds of that component. Several adjustments have already been planned for 26-27 to improve performance, to include strengthened/increased direct, explicit instruction and weekly assigned Standards Mastery i-Ready lessons to close gaps, in addition to schedule changes, bell-work updates, and tightening of behavioral expectations. ESE students will receive their services during the ELA block in a collaborative teaching model.

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 making an annual learning gain on the ELA FAST PM3 Assessment will increase from 65% to 68%.

Monitoring

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

• Assessment Data: After collaborative planning is in place, monitor i-Ready and statewide progress monitoring/FAST ELA assessments, including fluency data to identify student proficiency levels and guide Tier 1 (core and small group) and Tier 2 adjustments.
• Targeted Instruction: Use formative assessments and checks for understanding to determine and adjust whole and small-group instruction during the core ELA block.
• Walkthrough Alignment: Conduct weekly 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
Principal, Assistant Principal, 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: Explicit instruction is the primary instructional lever used by leadership, literacy coaches, and teachers to implement the district-adopted curriculum. As defined by the Bureau of School Improvement (BSI), it is intentional teaching with clear, direct presentation of content, concepts, and skills that does not rely on student inferencing. Instruction follows a structured, evidence-based approach with modeling, guided practice, and gradual release (I Do, We Do, You Do), including intentional sequencing, frequent checks for understanding, and ongoing feedback to ensure mastery.

Rationale:
Although our school is high performing, annual learning gains overall have declined since last year, and although gains for the lowest 25% increased, this area is our lowest-performing. This indicates a need to strengthen core instruction to accelerate growth. Implementation of Florida's State Standards through the district-adopted curricula, Benchmark Advance 2026, UFLI, and SAVVAS myPerspectives 2026, provides the foundation for high-quality literacy instruction. Consistent, explicit, and systematic instruction is ensured through intentional planning, modeling, and ongoing coaching by school-based teams, who support teachers in effectively using the curriculum. This includes a focus on clear modeling, guided practice, targeted feedback, and gradual release to close skill gaps and increase student proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1
Quarter 1: Establish Foundations of Coherent Explicit Tier 1 Instruction

Person Monitoring:
Alison, Walling, Myer

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
Establish and communicate clear expectations for Tier 1 explicit, standards-aligned instruction using Benchmark Advance 2026, UFLI, and SAVAAS as the first source for instruction. [Expectations based

on FDOE Literacy Instruction Practice Profiles].
• Gradual Release (I do, we do, you do)
• I do: Clear modeling and think alouds
• We do: Guided practice with checks for understanding and in-the-moment feedback
• You do: Active monitoring with circulation and mapping, providing immediate feedback to all students
• Structured student discourse tied to learning targets/intentions.
Develop norms for collaborative planning structure with coach/leadership:
• Planning for I Do, We Do, You Do
• Identifying CFUs in advance
• Anticipating student errors and misconceptions.
Set up collaborative planning time where grade-level teams work with the ESE Support Facilitator to connect Tier 1 instruction and interventions.
Establish expectations for UFLI implementation in K–2, including daily structured phonics lessons and routine fluency checks.
Plan and communicate a system of monitoring
• Calendar for walkthroughs
• Calendar for collaborative planning
• Coaching cycles
• Utilize and Calibrate walkthrough tool with leadership team.
• For BPIE indicators #17, #27, #28, ensure ESE teachers are participating in facilitated collaborative planning sessions with general education teachers, and utilize mainly a push-in, support facilitation model.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Support teachers with execution of explicit instruction and gradual release in daily lessons.
• Support K–2 teachers with implementation of UFLI with fidelity, including phonics routines and fluency practice.
• Lead collaborative planning conversations related to aligning Tier 1 instruction and supporting ESE students in general education classrooms.
• Model the gradual release process during collaborative planning and professional learning sessions using aligned instructional materials.
• Complete coaching cycles as needed.
• For BPIE Indicator #1, analyze data SWD performance data; identify barriers and initiate improvement steps.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE, ELL):
Use Benchmark Advance, UFLI (K–2), and SAVAAS as the primary instructional resources to teach Florida State Standards.
Implement explicit instruction using the gradual-release model:
• I Do: Model skills and thinking to include clear think-alouds.
• We Do: Guide students through scaffolded practice with teacher support.
• You Do: Provide independent practice with immediate feedback.
Use checks for understanding (CFUs) throughout instruction to monitor student understanding and adjust support, with circulation at the onset of the independent practice, with mapping and corrective feedback to every student.
Collaborate with grade-level teams, ESE support facilitators, and ELL staff during planning to support all learners.
K–2 teachers implement consistent daily UFLI lessons, weekly assessments, and fluency checks to monitor foundational reading skills and form small groups.

Action Step #2
Quarter 2: Strengthen Collaborative Planning Time

Person Monitoring:
Alison, Walling, Myer

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions
• Establish and protect dedicated collaborative planning time for grade-level teams to analyze student data, plan standards-aligned instruction, and develop targeted supports for all learners.
• Develop clear expectations and structures for collaborative planning meetings, including agendas, desired outcomes, evidence of student learning, and follow-up action steps.
• Monitor the effectiveness of collaborative planning through regular check-ins, classroom walkthroughs, and review of planning artifacts to ensure alignment between PLC discussions and classroom instruction.
• Provide professional learning and resources focused on high-impact literacy practices, data analysis, scaffolded instruction, and effective intervention planning.
• Facilitate a culture of shared responsibility and collective efficacy by celebrating team successes and addressing barriers that impact collaboration.
Literacy Coach Actions
• Support grade-level teams during collaborative planning by facilitating data analysis, identifying instructional priorities, and assisting teachers in developing standards-based lessons.
• Model effective literacy instruction, including explicit instruction, questioning strategies, small-group instruction, and scaffolded supports based on student needs.
• Assist teachers in analyzing formative and summative assessment data to identify trends, determine next steps, and adjust instruction to improve student outcomes.
• Collaborate with teachers to design targeted intervention and enrichment opportunities aligned to student needs and progress monitoring data.
• Provide ongoing coaching, feedback, and resources to strengthen implementation of agreed-upon literacy practices across classrooms.
Teacher Actions
• Engage consistently in collaborative planning meetings by bringing student data, reflecting on instructional practices, and actively contributing to team discussions and solutions.
• Use standards, assessment data, Practice Profiles, and student work samples to plan rigorous, explicit literacy instruction.
• Plan for strong Tier 1 instruction and the in-the-moment monitoring/feedback of student practice during the 'we do' and 'you do' portions.
• Implement collaboratively-developed instructional strategies and monitor student progress to determine the effectiveness of instruction.
• Participate in ongoing professional learning and apply feedback from peers, coaches, and administrators to strengthen classroom practices.
• Share successful strategies, student evidence, and instructional resources with colleagues to promote collective growth and improved student achievement.

Action Step #3
Quarter 3: Data-Driven Adjustments

Person Monitoring:
Alison, Walling, Myer

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

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.

• Adjust personnel resources to support student learning as needed to support lagging data indicators.
• Inspect intervention for connections directly to what students are learning in Tier 1
• Highlight high-effect-size instructional practices. Identify model classrooms implementing explicit instruction effectively and share those practices.
• Check to ensure UFLI and fluency routines in K–2 are improving student reading skills
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Model strong explicit instruction in both whole and small group settings (clear modeling, think alouds, guided practice, and aggressive monitoring with immediate feedback).
• Help teachers improve lesson delivery including pacing, modeling, and guided practice.
• Coach teachers on using student data during lessons to adjust instruction in the moment.
• Lead collaborative planning conversations on how explicit instruction impacts student learning.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE, ELL):
• Analyze FAST PM2 and i-Ready D2 data and create a plan to address any deficits, to include a review of performance by benchmark.
• Strengthen explicit instruction practices by increasing opportunities for student discourse, higher-order questioning during guided instruction.
• Use exit tickets, quick checks, and quizzes to identify specific skill gaps, then adjust next lesson (Tier 1, reteach, or enrichment) to target those needs.
• Implement consistent feedback practices that provide students with immediate corrective feedback and opportunities to explain their thinking during “we do” and “you do” portions of lessons.
• Provide immediate corrective feedback and opportunities for students to explain their thinking.
• Use formative assessment data to regroup students and align Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports to student needs.
• Collaborate regularly across Gen Ed, ESE, and ELL teams to ensure consistent instructional routines, pacing, expectations, and support across learning environments.

Action Step #4
Quarter 4: Monitor and Adjust

Person Monitoring:
Alison, Walling, Myer

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Review FAST, i-Ready, fluency data (K–2), and classroom assessments to see overall growth and 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, “all hands on deck” scheduling, focused small groups).
• Focus support on student on the cusp between levels 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, ELL):
• Continue analysis of data and adjust plans to address any deficits, to include a review of performance by benchmark.
• Consistently implement explicit instruction routines with strong alignment between Tier 1 instruction

and intervention supports.
• Increase opportunities for student discourse, collaborative learning, and higher-order questioning during guided instruction.
• Circulate during student practice and provide immediate corrective feedback.
• Collaborate across Gen Ed, ESE, and ELL teams to maintain consistent instructional routines, pacing, expectations, and supports across learning environments.

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 Learning Gains in Grade 5 declined, resulting in a decline in the overall Math Learning Gains component, from 74% in 2025 to 66% in 2026. Data indicates that in the bottom quartile, only 54% of 5th graders made an annual learning gain in math, which brought the average in that component down eight percentage points. Both 4th and 6th grade gains increased, but the percentage in 5th affected the average negatively. Several adjustments have already been planned for 26-27 to improve performance, to include strengthened/increased direct, explicit instruction, in the moment monitoring and feedback, in addition to schedule changes, bell-work updates, and tightening of behavioral expectations. ESE students will receive their services during the math block in a collaborative teaching model.

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 making an annual learning gain on the Math FAST PM3 Assessment will increase from 66% to 69%.

Monitoring

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

• Assessment Data: After collaborative planning is in place, monitor i-Ready and statewide progress monitoring/FAST Math assessments, to identify student proficiency levels and guide Tier 1 (core and small group) and Tier 2 adjustments.
• Targeted Instruction: Use formative assessments and checks for understanding to determine and

adjust whole and small-group instruction during the core math block.

• Walkthrough Alignment: Conduct weekly 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
Principal, Assistant Principal, 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: Explicit instruction is the primary instructional lever used by leadership, coaches, and teachers to implement the district-adopted curriculum. As defined by the Bureau of School Improvement (BSI), it is intentional teaching with clear, direct presentation of content, concepts, and skills that does not rely on student inferencing. Instruction follows a structured, evidence-based approach with modeling, guided practice, and gradual release (I Do, We Do, You Do), including intentional sequencing, frequent checks for understanding, and ongoing feedback to ensure mastery.

Rationale:
Although our school is high performing, annual learning gains overall as well as gains for the lowest 25% have declined since last year. This indicates a need to strengthen core instruction to accelerate growth. Implementation of Florida's State Standards through the district-adopted curricula, Reveal, CPALMS, and i-Ready Lessons, provides the foundation for high-quality mathematics instruction. Consistent, explicit, and systematic instruction is ensured through intentional planning, modeling, and ongoing coaching by school-based teams, who support teachers in effectively using the curriculum. This includes a focus on clear modeling, guided practice, targeted feedback, and gradual release to close skill gaps and increase student proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1
Quarter 1: Establish Foundations of Coherent Explicit Tier 1 Instruction

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach	Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
Establish and communicate clear expectations for Tier 1 explicit, standards-aligned instruction using

the Big Ms, Reveal, CPALMS, and i-Ready Lessons as the first source for instruction. [Expectations based on FDOE Instruction Practice Profiles].
• Gradual Release (I do, we do, you do)
• I do: Clear modeling and think alouds
• We do: Guided practice with checks for understanding and in-the-moment feedback
• You do: Active monitoring with circulation and mapping, providing immediate feedback to all students
• Structured student discourse tied to learning targets/intentions.
Develop norms for collaborative planning structure with coach/leadership:
• Planning for I Do, We Do, You Do
• Identifying CFUs in advance
• Anticipating student errors and misconceptions.
Set up collaborative planning time where grade-level teams work with the ESE Support Facilitator to connect Tier 1 instruction and interventions.
Plan and communicate a system of monitoring
• Calendar for walkthroughs
• Calendar for collaborative planning
• Coaching cycles
• Utilize and Calibrate walkthrough tool with leadership team.
Coach Actions:
• Support teachers with execution of explicit instruction and gradual release in daily lessons.
• Lead collaborative planning conversations related to aligning Tier 1 instruction and supporting ESE students in general education classrooms.
• Model the gradual release process during collaborative planning and professional learning sessions using aligned instructional materials.
• Complete coaching cycles as needed.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE, ELL):
Use Big Ms, Reveal, CPALMS, and i-Ready Lessons as the primary instructional resources to teach Florida State Standards.
Implement explicit instruction using the gradual-release model:
• I Do: Model skills and thinking to include clear think-alouds.
• We Do: Guide students through scaffolded practice with teacher support.
• You Do: Provide independent practice with immediate feedback.
Use checks for understanding (CFUs) throughout instruction to monitor student understanding and adjust support, with circulation at the onset of the independent practice, with mapping and corrective feedback to every student.
Collaborate with grade-level teams, ESE support facilitators, and ELL staff during planning to support all learners.

Action Step #2
Quarter 2: Strengthen Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:
Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Plan with Math Coach and Literacy Coach with PD on I Do and We Do, and the aggressive monitoring/feedback aspect of You Do
• Facilitate structured data meetings to analyze student performance and align Tier 1 instruction with Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.

• Monitor implementation of Big Ms and BPS Instructional Guide/Pacing.
• Use FAST, i-Ready, and classroom data to check student progress and guide next steps.
• Make sure Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions connect back to what students are learning in Tier 1.
• Conduct walkthroughs to monitor expectations for explicit instruction established in Q1 and provides feedback on the I Do and We Do.
Coach Actions:
• Lead data discussions that connect Tier 1 instruction, intervention, and student outcomes.
• Support Tier 1 and intervention teachers plan lessons using district curriculum and explicit instruction
strategies (Gradual Release etc).
• Model explicit instruction focusing on I Do and We Do (clear modeling, think-alouds, guided practice,) during small-group and whole-group lessons.
• Coach teachers on using Checks for Understanding - CFUs (checks for understanding) and adjusting explicit instruction based on student data.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE, ELL):
• Continue implementing standards-aligned curriculum materials consistently in both Tier 1 and intervention settings.
• Collaboratively plan explicit instruction lessons using Benchmark Advance and SAVAAS to strengthen alignment between Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction.
• Implement explicit instruction daily in whole-group and small-group settings using modeling, guided practice, independent practice, and targeted scaffolds.
• Use CFUs, formative assessments, and student data to adjust instruction and intervention supports.
• Maintain consistent instructional routines, academic language, and scaffolds across Tier 1 and Tier 2
settings to improve instructional coherence.

Action Step #3
Quarter 3: Data-Driven Adjustments

Person Monitoring:
Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

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.
• Adjust personnel resources to support student learning as needed to support lagging data indicators.
• Inspect intervention for connections directly to what students are learning in Tier 1
• Highlight high-effect-size instructional practices. Identify model classrooms implementing explicit instruction effectively and share those practices.
Literacy Coach Actions:
• Model strong explicit instruction in both whole and small group settings (clear modeling, think alouds, guided practice, and aggressive monitoring with immediate feedback).
• Help teachers improve lesson delivery including pacing, modeling, and guided practice.
• Coach teachers on using student data during lessons to adjust instruction in the moment.
• Lead collaborative planning conversations on how explicit instruction impacts student learning.
Teacher Actions (Gen Ed, ESE, ELL):
• Analyze FAST PM2 and i-Ready D2 data and create a plan to address any deficits, to include a review of performance by benchmark.
• Strengthen explicit instruction practices by increasing opportunities for student discourse, higher-order questioning during guided instruction.

• Use exit tickets, quick checks, and quizzes to identify specific skill gaps, then adjust next lesson (Tier 1, reteach, or enrichment) to target those needs.
• Implement consistent feedback practices that provide students with immediate corrective feedback and opportunities to explain their thinking during “we do” and “you do” portions of lessons.
• Provide immediate corrective feedback and opportunities for students to explain their thinking.
• Use formative assessment data to regroup students and align Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports to student needs.
• Collaborate regularly across Gen Ed, ESE, and ELL teams to ensure consistent instructional routines, pacing, expectations, and support across learning environments.

Action Step #4
Quarter 4: Monitor and Adjust

Person Monitoring:
Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Review FAST, i-Ready, and classroom assessments to see overall growth and 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, “all hands on deck” scheduling, focused small groups).
• Focus support on student on the cusp between levels and students close to proficiency to maximize learning gains.
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, ELL):
• Continue analysis of data and adjust plans to address any deficits, to include a review of performance by benchmark.
• Consistently implement explicit instruction routines with strong alignment between Tier 1 instruction and intervention supports.
• Increase opportunities for student discourse, collaborative learning, and higher-order questioning during guided instruction.
• Circulate during student practice and provide immediate corrective feedback.
• Collaborate across Gen Ed, ESE, and ELL teams to maintain consistent instructional routines, pacing, expectations, and supports across learning environments.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as

a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

The area of focus in science is strengthening high-quality Tier 1 explicit instruction to increase student achievement on the Florida Grade 5 Statewide Science Assessment (SSA). While we maintained a strong proficiency rate of 78%, analysis of state assessment, benchmark, classroom formative assessment, and instructional walkthrough data indicates the need to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency while also improving performance among students approaching proficiency. This focus emphasizes standards-aligned explicit instruction, consistent use of evidence-based instructional practices, frequent checks for understanding, data-driven instructional adjustments, and strategic integration of Penda to provide targeted practice aligned to grade-level standards. Strengthening Tier 1 instruction and monitoring implementation through collaboration, coaching, classroom observations, and ongoing feedback will ensure all students have access to rigorous science instruction and are better prepared to meet or exceed expectations on the Grade 5 Statewide Science Assessment.

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 scoring at proficiency on the Florida Grade 5 Statewide Science Assessment (SSA) will increase from 78% to 81%.

Monitoring

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

• Assessment Data: After collaborative planning is in place, monitor Penda assessments to identify student proficiency levels and guide Tier 1 (core and small group) and Tier 2 adjustments.
• Targeted Instruction: Use formative assessments and checks for understanding to determine and adjust whole and small-group instruction during the science block.
• Walkthrough Alignment: Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to look for evidence that agreed-upon content and instructional practices from collaborative planning are visible in instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Principal, Assistant Principal

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: Explicit instruction is the primary instructional lever used by leadership, literacy coaches, and teachers to implement the district-adopted curriculum. As defined by the Bureau of School Improvement (BSI), it is intentional teaching with clear, direct presentation of content, concepts, and skills that does not rely on student inferencing. Instruction follows a structured, evidence-based approach with modeling, guided practice, and gradual release (I Do, We Do, You Do), including intentional sequencing, frequent checks for understanding, and ongoing feedback to ensure mastery.

Rationale:
Although our school is high performing, Science performance has plateaued since last year, and declined four points from the previous year. This indicates a need to strengthen core instruction to accelerate growth. Consistent, explicit, and systematic instruction is ensured through intentional planning, modeling, and ongoing coaching by school-based teams, who support teachers in effectively using the curriculum. This includes a focus on clear modeling, guided practice, targeted feedback, and gradual release to close skill gaps and increase student proficiency, in addition to support and collaboration with the STEM teacher.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1
Quarter 1: Establish Foundations of High-Quality Tier 1 Explicit Science Instruction

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Principal, Assistant Principal	Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Communicate schoolwide expectations for standards-aligned Tier 1 explicit science instruction aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. Science Standards.
• Develop a Grade 5 science support schedule that provides additional science instructional time during the STEM resource block.
• Establish a walkthrough schedule focused on explicit instruction, student engagement, and science discourse.
• Monitor weekly Penda implementation and student completion through monthly data reviews.
• Analyze baseline science data to identify priority standards and instructional needs.
Coach/STEM Teacher Actions:
• Provide professional learning on explicit science instruction, CER (Claim-Evidence-Reasoning), and effective questioning strategies.
• Facilitate collaborative planning meetings with Grade 5 teachers to align classroom instruction and STEM lessons to priority standards.
• Model standards-aligned science lessons and provide push-in instructional support during core science instruction.
• Train teachers to use Penda assignments aligned to current instructional units.
• Begin coaching cycles with observation and actionable feedback focused on Tier 1 science

instruction.
Teacher Actions:
• Deliver daily explicit science instruction aligned to grade-level standards.
• Collaborate regularly with the STEM teacher to align classroom instruction, STEM lessons, and laboratory experiences.
• Assign and monitor weekly Penda lessons aligned to current standards.
• Use feedback from coaching and STEM push-in support to strengthen instructional practices.

Action Step #2
Quarter 2: Strengthen Collaborative Planning and Instruction

Person Monitoring:
Principal, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions
• Monitor PLCs to ensure collaborative planning includes classroom teachers and the STEM teacher.
• Ensure Grade 5 students consistently receive additional science instructional time during the STEM resource schedule.
• Conduct walkthroughs and provide timely feedback focused on explicit instruction and student engagement.
• Review schoolwide Penda implementation and completion reports monthly.
• Celebrate effective instructional practices across classrooms and STEM.
Coach/STEM Teacher Actions
• Facilitate weekly collaborative planning using standards, benchmark data, and anticipated misconceptions.
• Coordinate STEM lessons that reinforce Grade 5 science standards and prepare students for the Statewide Science Assessment.
• Provide push-in instructional support during science lessons to model questioning, vocabulary development, and hands-on investigations.
• Analyze common formative assessments and Penda reports with teachers.
• Continue individualized coaching cycles with feedback and reflection.
Teacher Actions
• Participate in collaborative planning with grade-level teammates and the STEM teacher.
• Implement explicit instructional routines including modeling, guided practice, and independent application.
• Integrate science vocabulary and writing into daily instruction.
• Utilize additional STEM instructional time to reinforce classroom learning.
• Review Penda and formative assessment data to adjust instruction.

Action Step #3
Quarter 3: Data-Driven Instructional Adjustments

Person Monitoring:
Principal, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions
• Review benchmark, walkthrough, and Penda data to monitor progress toward Grade 5 Statewide Science Assessment goals.
• Increase classroom observations focused on explicit instruction and implementation of instructional feedback.

• Monitor the effectiveness of additional STEM instructional time for Grade 5 students.
• Allocate coaching and STEM support based on student achievement data.
• Communicate schoolwide progress toward science achievement goals.
Coach/STEM Teacher Actions
• Lead data meetings using benchmark, formative assessment, and Penda reports.
• Provide targeted push-in support to reteach priority standards and address student misconceptions.
• Model lessons focused on challenging Grade 5 science standards identified through data analysis.
• Collaborate with teachers to adjust STEM lessons based on student performance.
• Monitor implementation of coaching recommendations through follow-up observations.
Teacher Actions
• Analyze benchmark, formative assessment, and Penda data to identify unfinished learning.
• Adjust Tier 1 instruction through targeted reteaching and flexible grouping.
• Collaborate with the STEM teacher to reinforce priority standards during STEM instruction.
• Assign targeted Penda lessons to address student learning gaps.
• Monitor student progress weekly and document instructional adjustments.

Action Step #4
Quarter 4: Monitor and Adjust

Person Monitoring:
Principal, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
• Review assessments to see overall growth and how well Tier 1 and small-group instruction are working together.
• When data shows students are not making expected gains, put extra supports in place (reteach blocks, “all hands on deck” scheduling, focused small groups).
• Review STEM and Science Teacher schedules and collaborative planning to ensure focused support is ongoing.
• Monitor PENDA data and address areas of need.
Coach/STEM Teacher Actions:
• Help 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.
• Modify STEM schedule and support instruction on 3rd and 4th grade science standards during push-in and STEM lab time.
• Monitor PENDA data and address areas of need.
Teacher Actions:
• Continue analysis of data and adjust plans to address any deficits, to include a review of performance by science standards.
• Monitor PENDA data and address areas of need.
• Consistently implement explicit instruction routines with strong alignment between Tier 1 instruction and intervention supports.
• Increase opportunities for student discourse, collaborative learning, and higher-order questioning during explicit instruction.
• Circulate during student practice and provide immediate corrective feedback.
• Collaborate across Gen Ed, ESE, and ELL teams to maintain consistent instructional routines, pacing, expectations, and supports across learning environments.

Area of Focus #4

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

specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

No Answer Entered

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

No Answer Entered

Monitoring

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

No Answer Entered

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Person Monitoring: **By When/Frequency:**

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

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Other: Positive Behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

The Area of Focus is Positive Student Behavior. This area affects student learning. A 2023 meta-analysis of 93,000+ students (PubMed) found that positive classroom behavior and emotional regulation were strong predictors of academic engagement and motivation. Positive student behavior enhances learning by increasing time on task, engagement, and collaboration while reducing disruptions. It contributes to a safe and respectful classroom culture where students and teachers thrive.

The Area of Focus was identified based on Climate Survey results and discipline data. For a few years, there was an increase in office referrals showing an increase in negative student behavior in the classroom environment. This trend had an impact on student learning gains and achievement in the SY2024-2025 for our Lowest 25% in English Language Arts. In SY2025-2026 Holland focused on improving Positive Behavior in the classrooms and school which resulted in a significant decrease in office referrals. We will continue to focus on Positive Behavior for the SY2026-2027.

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.

Last year's goal was by May 2026, the number of discipline referrals will decrease by 3% from 253 in SY2024-2025 to 245 in SY2025-2026. The final referral count for the SY2025-2026 was 105 referrals.

By May 2027, the number of discipline referrals will decrease by 3% from 105 in SY2025-2026 to 102 in SY2026-2027.

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.

To monitor this Area of Focus for the desired outcome, the school leadership team will use Power BI to track disciplone referals monthly and by grade level. There will be Monthly Discipline Data Review

to analyze office discipline referral data to track trends by grade level, location, time of day, and type of infraction. The data will be presented to grade levels during MTSS meetings. Students with repeated referrals will be identified for Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavior interventions with progress monitoring every 2–4 weeks.

Ongoing monitoring of behavior will support improved student achievement by Maximized Instructional Time, Improved School Climate, and Informed Interventions. Early identification of behavior patterns will allow for timely interventions that support students and prevent chronic disciplinary issues.

Students with Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) will be monitored frequently and consistently to ensure they are effective and adjusted as needed. Frequent monitoring ensures the BIP is effective, allows the team to identify progress or concerns early, provides documentation for needed changes, and helps prevent behavior from escalating through timely adjustments.

The school leadership team will conduct implementation fidelity checks quarterly to ensure that schoolwide behavior expectations, and positive reinforcement strategies are consistently applied. Fewer behavioral disruptions will result in more time spent on task and an increase in student learning and achievement in the SY2026-2027.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Kimberly Walling

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:
Restorative Practices: Classroom Management Restorative practices are relationship-building and problem-solving strategies used in schools to promote positive behavior, resolve conflict, and repair harm by teaching accountability, building empathy, strengthening relationships, and restoring safety and trust in a respectful, community-based way. This intervention will be monitored during walkthroughs.

Rationale:
Effective classroom management directly supports academic achievement by creating an environment where both teaching and learning can thrive. Studies consistently show that effective classroom management is one of the strongest predictors of academic success, particularly in the early grades. For instance, Marzano & Marzano (2003) found that effective management can boost student achievement by as much as 20 percentile points.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1
Explicitly teach school-wide and classroom expectations.

Person Monitoring:
Kimberly Walling

By When/Frequency:
August 2026

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
During pre-planning, Administration will review best practices for classroom management and procedures aligned with IPPAS Dimension 2, Learning Environment. Every teacher will be provided with posters of the Hornet Hive Five, Holland Hornet Voice Levels, and School-Wide Rules to display in each classroom. Teachers will create class expectations/rules to be posted next to the school-wide rules poster.
Administration will visit every classroom and discuss Holland's school-wide expectations and procedures.
The Administration Team will verify that school wide rules and classroom rules are posted in every classroom, and monitor the impact of this action by observing student behavior during classroom walkthroughs.

Action Step #2
Monitor Behavior Data

Person Monitoring:
Kimberly Walling

By When/Frequency:
Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Administration will utilize Power BI to monitor behavior data and incident reports to identify trends and areas needing targeted interventions. The data will be shared during MTSS Leadership Meetings and Data Meetings with grade levels.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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

Dissemination Methods

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

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

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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

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

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

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

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

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

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

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

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

Process to Review the Use of Resources

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

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

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

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. **No**

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