

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

ACADEMIR CHARTER SCHOOL OF MATH AND SCIENCE



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..... 5
 - D. Early Warning Systems 6
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 9
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 10
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 11
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 12
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 13
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 16
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 17
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 24
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 30
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 34
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 35

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

The Department's SIP template meets:

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of ACSMS is to provide students with a well-rounded elementary school education, through a challenging program, focused on mathematics and science using innovative reform based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision for the AcadeMir Charter Schools of Math and Science is to provide students with a challenging and rigorous curriculum enabling students to be well prepared for higher education and life through adherence to an unwavering mission, shared purpose and clearly articulated goals. Our program allows for scientific exploration and mathematical application along with technology integration through real world connections: by incorporating critical thinking, communication, collaboration, creativity and technological literacy that goes far beyond the basic knowledge to meet the challenges of the 21st century global economy. Our goal is to develop students into critical thinkers and problem solvers by providing them with hands-on learning experiences that will enable all students to achieve academic success and become lifelong learners.

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

Liza Morera-Taylor

932229@dadeschools.net

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Implement and oversee school safety procedures and processes. Manage school activities and staff, including teachers and support personnel. Establish and oversee class schedules. Develop, implement, and maintain curriculum standards. Counsel and discipline students.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Marcey Gist

802053@dadeschools.net

Position Title

Instructional Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The job responsibilities of the Instructional Reading Coach include but are not limited to:

- Supports teachers with reading instruction, lesson planning, and pacing
- Models evidence-based reading strategies and best practices
- Provides coaching, feedback, and professional development
- Analyzes student data to identify needs and plan interventions
- Supports implementation of the school's ELA curriculum and reading programs
- Conducts classroom walkthroughs and monitors instructional practices
- Assists with differentiated instruction for Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3, and ELL students
- Coordinates progress monitoring and supports MTSS implementation
- Helps teachers use assessment results to guide instruction
- Collaborates with administrators, teachers, and support staff to improve student achievement
- Locates and shares instructional resources
- Monitors reading goals, intervention plans, and schoolwide literacy initiatives

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Yesenia Hector

953840@dadeschools.net

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee the curriculum and instructional programs within the school. Work in collaboration with the

school principal to ensure the school community is safe. Manage the testing procedures, security, and trainings within the school.

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.

Stakeholders are encouraged to participate in the SIP development process through meetings and surveys. Monthly department and lead teacher meetings provide opportunities to gather ideas, suggestions, and feedback from teachers and leadership teams. Additionally, EESAC meetings and Title I parent surveys help us collect valuable input from parents and members of the school community.

3. SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the state academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The SIP will be reviewed and discussed at our first EESAC meeting and following each progress monitoring assessment for grades K–5. During these review periods, the leadership team will analyze student achievement data to identify appropriate next steps toward meeting schoolwide academic goals. The leadership team will also collaborate with grade-level teams and individual teachers to ensure that the data is thoroughly examined and used to make informed instructional adjustments.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY KG-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	82.7%
CHARTER SCHOOL	YES
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2025-26: C 2024-25: A 2023-24: C 2022-23: C 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	78	78	86	79	88	62				471
Absent 10% or more school days										0
One or more suspensions								2		2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)										0
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		38	43	20	26	5				132
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	3	14	21	14	18	5				75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	1	35	49	66						151
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	3	5	2	21	26	7	5	2		71

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

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
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	79	79	87	82	88	61				476
Absent 10% or more school days				1	2	1				4
One or more suspensions			1	3	1	1				6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				1	21					22
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment			17	28	28	8				81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment					16	9				25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)				1						1
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		5	4	15	16	9				49

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			17	28	28	8				81

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				8						8
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 CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]
ELA Achievement*	52	67	62	54	65	59	41	63	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	51	67	61	40	65	59	37	63	58
ELA Learning Gains	62	66	63	62	65	60	50	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68	61	58	61	62	56	57	62	57
Math Achievement*	62	74	66	70	72	64	47	69	62
Math Learning Gains	52	65	64	71	66	63	47	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28	55	50	68	59	51	50	58	52
Science Achievement	49	63	62	70	63	58	13	61	57
Social Studies Achievement*			95			92			
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					66	63		64	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	53%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	424
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
53%	61%	46%	54%	58%	51%	

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	49%	No		
English Language Learners	50%	No		
Hispanic Students	54%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	50%	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	52%	51%	62%	68%	62%	52%	28%	49%					
Students With Disabilities	36%		79%		45%	36%							
English Language Learners	46%	47%	63%	68%	60%	51%	25%	41%					
Hispanic Students	53%	56%	61%	66%	64%	52%	28%	51%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	50%	47%	61%	69%	60%	48%	26%	42%					

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	54%	40%	62%	61%	70%	71%	68%	70%					50%
Students With Disabilities	21%	17%	29%		39%	41%							47%
English Language Learners	49%	35%	67%	67%	67%	67%	62%	68%					50%
Hispanic Students	55%	41%	63%	63%	71%	72%	68%	68%					50%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	53%	38%	62%	60%	69%	70%	67%	68%					50%

Page 15 of 36

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	51%	64%	-13%	60%	-9%
ELA	4	46%	64%	-18%	60%	-14%
ELA	5	61%	65%	-4%	61%	0%
Math	3	62%	72%	-10%	66%	-4%
Math	4	64%	71%	-7%	65%	-1%
Math	5	60%	67%	-7%	62%	-2%
Science	5	50%	59%	-9%	60%	-10%

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 ELA Lowest 25th Percentile, which increased from 61% in 2025 to 68% in 2026, representing a 7-percentage-point increase. This growth reflects the school's increased focus on supporting students performing below grade-level expectations. ACSMS implemented more targeted small-group instruction, used assessment data to identify specific skill deficits, increased progress monitoring, and provided differentiated interventions based on individual student needs. Teachers also collaborated through data-driven planning to monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. These targeted actions contributed to improved outcomes for the school's lowest-performing students and will continue to be incorporated into the school's instructional practices.

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 data component showing the lowest performance was Science Achievement, with ACSMS earning 28% in 2026, compared to 55% for the district and 50% for the state. This also represents a significant decline from the school's 68% performance in 2025. Contributing factors may include gaps in students' mastery and retention of grade-level science standards, the need for stronger alignment between instruction and the rigor of state assessments, and insufficient opportunities for students to apply scientific concepts through standards-based questioning and hands-on learning. The downward trend from 2025 to 2026 indicates a need to prioritize science instruction through more frequent progress monitoring, targeted remediation of identified standards, data-driven instructional planning, and increased exposure to rigorous, standards-aligned science tasks.

Greatest Decline

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

The data component showing the greatest decline was Science Achievement, which decreased from 68% in 2025 to 28% in 2026, representing a 40-percentage-point decline. The data indicates a need to strengthen the consistency and effectiveness of science instruction. In addition to this being a

different cohort of students, contributing factors may have included gaps in students' mastery and retention of tested science standards, insufficient opportunities to spiral previously taught content, and a need for more frequent progress monitoring to identify and address learning gaps before the state assessment.

Greatest Gap

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

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was Science Achievement, with ACSMS achieving 28% compared to the state average of 50%, representing a 22-percentage-point gap. This area also demonstrated a significant downward trend from the prior year, when ACSMS achieved 68% and exceeded the state average of 51%. Factors that may have contributed to this gap include inconsistencies in students' mastery and retention of science standards, insufficient spiraling and review of previously taught content, and a need for more frequent progress monitoring to identify and address learning gaps throughout the year.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

The EWS data identifies reading proficiency and substantial reading deficiencies as primary areas of concern. A total of 132 students are performing at Level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment, with the greatest concentrations in Grades 1 and 2. Additionally, 151 students in Grades K–3 are identified as having a substantial reading deficiency, with particularly high numbers in Grades 2 and 3. These data indicate a need for continued emphasis on foundational literacy skills, early identification, targeted interventions, and frequent progress monitoring. A secondary area of concern is mathematics, with 75 students performing at Level 1 on the statewide Math assessment and 71 students identified with a substantial mathematics deficiency. ACSMS will continue to use EWS and assessment data to identify students requiring additional support and provide targeted, differentiated interventions to strengthen student achievement.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Increase 3-5th grade overall ELA percent proficiency to at least 58%, by closing learning gaps.
2. Increase the growth percentage of Lowest 25 Percentile students in Mathematics to at least 50%.
3. Increase 5th grade science proficiency to 62%.
4. Increase the ELA proficiency for our ESE student population to at least 52%

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 Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Our area of focus is improving mathematics achievement for students identified in the lowest 25th percentile through the implementation of evidence-based instructional practices, targeted interventions, and data-driven instruction. These students have demonstrated significant deficits in number sense, mathematical reasoning, problem-solving, and grade-level mathematical concepts, resulting in performance below proficiency expectations.

Analysis of FAST PM3 Mathematics data, i-Ready Diagnostic data, district assessments, and classroom formative assessments revealed that students in the lowest quartile consistently perform below grade-level standards and require additional support to close achievement gaps. Data also indicate a need to strengthen teacher capacity in analyzing student performance data, differentiating instruction, and implementing effective mathematics intervention strategies. Therefore, enhancing instructional practices focused on the lowest-performing mathematics students has been identified as a critical schoolwide priority.

Measurable Outcome

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

By FAST PM3, at least 58% of students identified in the lowest 25th percentile in Mathematics will demonstrate measurable growth toward grade-level proficiency as evidenced by FAST Mathematics Progress Monitoring assessments, i-Ready Mathematics Diagnostic data, and classroom-based assessments.

Additionally, students will meet or exceed their individual growth goals and show increased proficiency in grade-level mathematics standards as measured by FAST PM3 and i-Ready Mathematics data.

Monitoring

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

the desired outcome.

This Area of Focus will be monitored through monthly reviews of FAST Mathematics progress monitoring data, i-Ready Mathematics diagnostic reports, district assessments, classroom formative assessment results, and intervention progress reports. School administrators, instructional coaches, and classroom teachers will conduct regular data chats to review student progress and adjust instructional supports as needed.

Administrative walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and coaching cycles will be used to monitor the implementation of evidence-based mathematics instructional practices, differentiated instruction, and intervention effectiveness. Ongoing monitoring will ensure interventions are implemented with fidelity and will support improved student achievement outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Yesenia Hector and Liza Morera- Taylor

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:

Implementation of targeted small-group mathematics intervention utilizing i-Ready Personalized Instruction, teacher-led intervention groups, and standards-based mathematics lessons focused on number sense, operations, mathematical reasoning, and problem-solving skills.

Rationale:

Data analysis revealed a need for more intentional use of assessment data to guide mathematics instruction and intervention decisions. Ongoing data review and coaching support will improve instructional responsiveness and ensure students receive targeted interventions aligned to their needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising 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

Mathematics Data Review and Student Identification

Person Monitoring:

Yesenia Hector/ Liza Morera- Taylor

By When/Frequency:

Monthly and following each FAST Progress Monitoring Window

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

step:

Teachers and instructional leaders will analyze FAST Mathematics, i-Ready, and classroom assessment data to identify students within the lowest 25th percentile and monitor growth toward proficiency goals. Monthly data meetings will be held to evaluate progress, identify trends, and adjust instructional supports and interventions as needed.

Action Step #2

Targeted Small-Group Mathematics Intervention

Person Monitoring:

Yesenia Hector/ Liza Morera- Taylor

By When/Frequency:

Daily Instruction; Weekly Walkthroughs

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

Teachers will provide targeted small-group instruction focused on addressing identified deficits in number sense, operations, mathematical reasoning, and problem-solving. Classroom walkthroughs, intervention logs, and student performance data will be used to monitor implementation and effectiveness.

Action Step #3

Professional Learning and Instructional Coaching in Mathematics

Person Monitoring:

Yesenia Hector/ Liza Morera- Taylor

By When/Frequency:

Biweekly Coaching Cycles and Monthly Professional Development Sessions

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

Teachers will participate in ongoing professional learning focused on differentiated mathematics instruction, mathematical discourse, data-driven decision making, and intervention strategies for struggling learners. Coaching cycles, classroom observations, and student achievement data will be used to measure implementation and impact on student outcomes.

Area of Focus #2

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

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

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

Description

The Area of Focus is improving standards-aligned ELA instructional practices across grades 2–5. Teachers will provide explicit instruction in foundational reading skills, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and written responses. Differentiated small-group instruction, targeted interventions, after-school tutoring, and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to close identified learning gaps, support ESE students, and increase overall ELA proficiency.

Rationale

Prior-year data identified significant reading needs across grades 2–5. In Grade 2, 43 students scored at Level 1 in ELA and 49 students were identified with a substantial reading deficiency. In Grade 3, 20 students scored at Level 1 and 66 students had a substantial reading deficiency. Additionally, 26 Grade 4 students and five Grade 5 students scored at Level 1 in ELA. These gaps limit students' ability to comprehend grade-level texts, produce evidence-based written responses, and successfully access content across subject areas. Therefore, strengthening ELA instructional practices, intervention, and tutoring was identified as a crucial schoolwide need.

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.

Grade 2: Prior-year data showed that 43 students scored at Level 1 in ELA. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the school will reduce this number by at least 20%, from 43 to 34 or fewer students.

Grade 3: Prior-year ELA proficiency was 51%, with 20 students scoring at Level 1. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, Grade 3 ELA proficiency will increase from 51% to at least 58%.

Grade 4: Prior-year data showed that 26 students scored at Level 1 in ELA. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the school will reduce this number by at least 20%, from 26 to 21 or fewer students.

Grade 5: Prior-year data showed that five students scored at Level 1 in ELA. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the school will reduce this number from five to four or fewer students.

Schoolwide Grades 3–5: Prior-year overall ELA proficiency was 52%. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, overall ELA proficiency will increase to at least 58%, ELA learning gains will increase from 62% to 65%, and learning gains for the Lowest 25% will be maintained at 68% or higher.

Monitoring

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

Teachers will implement meaningful differentiated instruction daily, using current student data to create flexible groups and address identified reading needs.

School administrators and the reading coach will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs to monitor standards-aligned ELA instruction, differentiated small groups, and targeted interventions.

Teachers will review i-Ready, FAST, classroom assessment, and progress-monitoring data during monthly grade-level and MTSS meetings.

Students receiving targeted interventions or after-school tutoring will be monitored biweekly to determine their progress toward individual ELA goals.

Benchmark results will be reviewed after each assessment window to adjust instruction and measure progress toward 58% ELA proficiency, 65% ELA learning gains, and at least 68% learning gains

among the Lowest 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Ms.Gist, Ms. Varela, Classroom Teachers

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:

In grades 2–5, teachers will implement explicit, systematic, standards-aligned ELA instruction through modeling, guided practice, corrective feedback, flexible grouping, and meaningful daily differentiated instruction based on current student data. Students performing below grade level, including ESE students, will receive targeted Tier 2 or Tier 3 reading interventions during the school day and through after-school tutoring. Interventions will focus on foundational reading skills, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and evidence-based written responses. i-Ready will provide individualized, skill-specific instruction and practice aligned with identified learning gaps. Through the MTSS process, assessment and classroom data will be used to identify students requiring intervention, determine the appropriate level of support, establish measurable goals, and develop intervention plans. Tier 2 interventions will provide targeted small-group instruction, while Tier 3 interventions will provide more intensive, individualized instruction with increased frequency and duration. Classroom teachers, interventionists, the reading coach, and the MTSS coordinator will document intervention attendance, skills taught, instructional frequency, and student progress. Progress will be monitored biweekly using i-Ready reports, FAST assessments, curriculum-based measures, common assessments, student work, and intervention logs. The MTSS team will review intervention data monthly to determine whether interventions should be continued, adjusted, intensified, or discontinued. Benchmark data will be reviewed after each assessment window to measure progress toward 58% ELA proficiency, 65% ELA learning gains, and at least 68% learning gains among the Lowest 25%.

Rationale:

The interventions were selected because prior-year data showed significant ELA learning gaps across grades 2–5, including high numbers of students performing at Level 1 and students with substantial reading deficiencies. Explicit, standards-aligned instruction, meaningful daily differentiated instruction, small-group intervention, i-Ready, and after-school tutoring will provide students with targeted support based on their individual needs. The MTSS process will ensure that students are identified early, placed in the appropriate level of intervention, and monitored regularly. Using progress-monitoring data to adjust or intensify interventions will help close learning gaps and support the school's goals of achieving at least 58% ELA proficiency, 65% ELA learning gains, and 68% learning gains among the Lowest 25%.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising 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

Implement Daily Data-Driven Differentiated ELA Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Administrators, Classroom Teachers, Ms. Gist, Ms. Varela

By When/Frequency:

Ms. September 2026, ongoing daily throughout the school year.

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

Action Step 1

Teachers will implement daily standards-aligned, data-driven differentiated ELA instruction using flexible small groups, explicit modeling, guided practice, and corrective feedback. Administrators and the reading coach will monitor implementation through lesson-plan reviews, classroom walkthroughs, student work, and teacher feedback. FAST, i-Ready, and common assessment data will measure the impact on student achievement.

Action Step 2

Through the MTSS process, students performing below grade level, including ESE students, will be identified and provided targeted Tier 2 or Tier 3 reading interventions and after-school tutoring focused on identified skill gaps. Teachers and interventionists will document attendance, instructional frequency, skills taught, and student progress. The MTSS team will review biweekly progress-monitoring data monthly to determine whether interventions should be continued, adjusted, or intensified.

Action Step 3

The reading coach and grade-level teams will conduct monthly collaborative data meetings to analyze FAST, i-Ready, common assessment, intervention, and student-work data. Teachers will use the findings to regroup students, adjust instruction, and plan targeted lessons. Benchmark results will be reviewed after each assessment window to measure progress toward the school's ELA proficiency and learning-gains goals.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Multiple Early Warning Signs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Area of Focus: Multiple Early Warning Signs

The school's Area of Focus is reducing the number of students demonstrating multiple Early Warning System indicators in grades 2–5. These indicators include Level 1 performance on statewide ELA and mathematics assessments, and substantial reading or mathematics deficiencies. The school will use ongoing data monitoring, targeted academic interventions, attendance support, behavioral supports, and parent communication to address students' needs before they become more significant barriers

to achievement.

Grade 2

Grade 2 data show concerns related to academic performance and behavior. Seventeen students scored at Level 1 in ELA, four students were identified with a substantial mathematics deficiency, and one student received one or more suspensions.

These warning signs may affect students' ability to develop the foundational reading, mathematics, and self-management skills needed for success in the intermediate grades. Without early intervention, students may continue to experience difficulty accessing grade-level instruction.

Grade 2 was identified as an area of need because the data show that some students are already demonstrating academic and behavioral risk factors at an early stage. Targeted foundational skills instruction and behavioral support are necessary to prevent these concerns from becoming long-term patterns.

Grade 3

Grade 3 demonstrates concerns across several Early Warning System indicators. The data show that 28 students scored at Level 1 in ELA, 15 students were identified with a substantial mathematics deficiency, three students received one or more suspensions, one student failed ELA, one student was absent for 10% or more of the school days, and one student was identified with a substantial reading deficiency.

These indicators may negatively affect students' ability to meet grade-level expectations and successfully transition from learning to read to reading to learn. Attendance and behavioral concerns may also reduce instructional time and limit the effectiveness of academic interventions.

Grade 3 was identified as a crucial area of need because it contains academic, attendance, and behavioral warning signs. The combination of these indicators demonstrates the need for targeted instruction, frequent progress monitoring, and coordinated academic and behavioral interventions.

Grade 4

Grade 4 represents the school's most significant area of concern. Twenty-eight students scored at Level 1 in ELA, 21 students failed ELA, 16 students scored at Level 1 in mathematics, two students were absent for 10% or more of the school days, and one student received one or more suspensions. These warning signs directly affect students' ability to access grade-level content, demonstrate proficiency on state assessments, and make adequate academic progress. The high number of ELA course failures suggests that many students need intensive support with reading comprehension, vocabulary, written response, and grade-level standards.

Grade 4 was identified as a crucial need because it has the greatest concentration of Early Warning System indicators, particularly in ELA. The prior-year data show a clear need for intensive academic intervention, progress monitoring, attendance support, and instructional adjustments.

Grade 5

Grade 5 data also show multiple areas of concern. Eight students scored at Level 1 in ELA, nine students scored at Level 1 in mathematics, nine students were identified with a substantial

mathematics deficiency, one student was absent for 10% or more of the school days, and one student received one or more suspensions.

These indicators may affect students' readiness for middle school, where they will be expected to work more independently and apply increasingly complex reading and mathematics skills across content areas. Gaps that remain unaddressed may lead to additional course failures and continued low assessment performance.

Grade 5 was identified as an area of need because the data show continuing academic concerns in both ELA and mathematics, along with attendance and behavioral indicators. Targeted intervention is necessary to strengthen students' skills and support a successful transition to middle school.

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.

Grade 2

- Prior-year data showed 43 students at Level 1 in ELA, 21 at Level 1 in mathematics, 49 with a substantial reading deficiency, and two with a substantial mathematics deficiency.
- Current data show 17 students at Level 1 in ELA, four with a substantial mathematics deficiency, and one student with a suspension.
- These indicators may interfere with students' development of foundational academic and behavioral skills.
- By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the school will reduce Level 1 ELA students from 17 to 14 or fewer, mathematics deficiencies from four to three or fewer, suspensions from one to zero, and students with two or more EWS indicators by at least 20%.

Grade 3

- Prior-year data showed 20 students at Level 1 in ELA, 14 at Level 1 in mathematics, 66 with a substantial reading deficiency, and 21 with a substantial mathematics deficiency.
- Current data show 28 students at Level 1 in ELA, 15 with a substantial mathematics deficiency, three with suspensions, one ELA course failure, and one student with chronic absenteeism.
- These indicators may limit access to grade-level instruction and interfere with the transition from learning to read to reading to learn.
- By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the school will reduce Level 1 ELA students from 28 to 22 or fewer, mathematics deficiencies from 15 to 12 or fewer, suspensions from three to one or fewer, ELA course failures and chronic absenteeism to zero, and students with two or more EWS indicators by at least 20%.

Grade 4

- Prior-year data showed 26 students at Level 1 in ELA, 18 at Level 1 in mathematics, and 26 with a substantial mathematics deficiency.

- Current data show 28 students at Level 1 in ELA, 16 at Level 1 in mathematics, 21 ELA course failures, two students with chronic absenteeism, and one student with a suspension.
- Grade 4 has the greatest concentration of academic, attendance, and behavioral concerns, which may prevent students from meeting grade-level standards.
- By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the school will reduce ELA course failures from 21 to 10 or fewer, Level 1 ELA students from 28 to 22 or fewer, Level 1 mathematics students from 16 to 13 or fewer, chronic absenteeism from two to one or fewer, suspensions from one to zero, and students with two or more EWS indicators by at least 20%.

Grade 5

- Prior-year data showed five students at Level 1 in ELA, five at Level 1 in mathematics, and seven with a substantial mathematics deficiency.
- Current data show eight students at Level 1 in ELA, nine at Level 1 in mathematics, nine with a substantial mathematics deficiency, one student with chronic absenteeism, and one student with a suspension.
- These indicators may affect students' readiness for middle school and their ability to work independently with increasingly complex content.
- By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the school will reduce Level 1 ELA students from eight to six or fewer, Level 1 mathematics students from nine to seven or fewer, mathematics deficiencies from nine to seven or fewer, chronic absenteeism and suspensions to zero, and students with two or more EWS indicators by at least 20%.

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.

- The MTSS team will review Early Warning System data monthly, including attendance, suspensions, course failures, and ELA and mathematics performance.
- Students demonstrating two or more early warning signs will receive targeted Tier 2 or Tier 3 academic, behavioral, or attendance interventions.
- Student progress will be monitored biweekly for Tier 2 interventions and weekly for Tier 3 interventions.
- Grade-level teams will use progress-monitoring data to continue, adjust, or intensify interventions based on each student's response.
- Ongoing monitoring will support early identification and timely intervention, resulting in improved attendance, behavior, ELA and mathematics achievement, and fewer students demonstrating multiple early warning signs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Ms. Taylor, Ms. Hector, Ms. Gist, Ms. Varela

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:

Grades 2–3 Implement explicit, systematic small-group reading instruction and after school tutoring using the core ELA program, i-Ready instructional pathways, and Florida Center for Reading Research strategies targeting phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Provide targeted mathematics intervention using explicit modeling, manipulatives, guided practice, corrective feedback, and i-Ready lessons aligned with identified skill gaps. Monitor Tier 2 students biweekly and Tier 3 students weekly using curriculum-based measures, i-Ready reports, classroom assessments, and intervention logs. Grades 4–5 Provide targeted small-group ELA intervention focused on fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, written responses, and grade-level standards through explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice, and immediate feedback. Provide mathematics intervention targeting prerequisite skills and grade-level standards using differentiated small groups, visual models, problem-solving strategies, and i-Ready personalized instruction. Monitor students through biweekly or weekly progress checks, common assessments, course grades, i-Ready growth reports, and intervention fidelity logs. All Relevant Grade Levels Implement a multi-tiered system of support, including PBIS, Check-In/Check-Out, attendance monitoring, mentoring, parent communication, and individualized academic or behavioral plans for students with multiple early warning signs. The MTSS team will review intervention data monthly to determine whether students are responding adequately and whether interventions should be continued, adjusted, intensified, or discontinued. Effectiveness will be measured by reductions in Level 1 performance, course failures, chronic absenteeism, suspensions, academic deficiencies, and the number of students demonstrating two or more early warning signs.

Rationale:

The interventions were selected because prior-year and current EWS data show persistent concerns in ELA, mathematics, attendance, behavior, and course performance across grades 2–5. Explicit, systematic small-group instruction allows teachers to target students' specific skill gaps and provide modeling, guided practice, immediate feedback, and additional learning time. i-Ready and curriculum-based assessments provide individualized instruction and ongoing data that teachers can use to adjust interventions based on each student's progress. PBIS, Check-In/Check-Out, attendance monitoring, and family communication address the behavioral and attendance barriers that can reduce instructional time and negatively affect achievement. Regular MTSS monitoring ensures that interventions are implemented consistently and are continued, adjusted, or intensified based on student response, increasing the likelihood of improved ELA and mathematics achievement and fewer students demonstrating multiple early warning signs.

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

Multiple Early Warning Signs Intervention and Progress-Monitoring Plan

Person Monitoring:

MTSS Team, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers

By When/Frequency:

Beginning September 2026 and ongoing throughout the school year; interventions will occur weekly, progress will be monitored biweekly, and the MTSS team will review data monthly.

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

The MTSS team, reading coach, and classroom teachers will review EWS, assessment, attendance, and course-performance data to identify and group students requiring additional support. Teachers and interventionists will implement targeted small-group ELA and mathematics interventions based on identified skill gaps. Student progress will be monitored through biweekly assessments, i-Ready reports, attendance records, course grades, and intervention logs. The MTSS team will review the data monthly and continue, adjust, or intensify interventions based on student response. The impact will be measured by improved ELA and mathematics performance, improved attendance, fewer course failures, and a reduction in students demonstrating multiple early warning signs.

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.

We will disseminate the SIP via EESAC meetings to all stakeholders. We will also discuss the SIP with faculty and staff during monthly faculty meetings. The school's webpage is acsmas.com.

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)).

ACSMS will continue to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders through consistent communication, meaningful engagement opportunities, and collaborative partnerships that support the school's mission and the academic, social, and emotional needs of students. Families will be kept informed of student progress through progress reports, report cards, parent-teacher conferences, school communication platforms, and ongoing communication with teachers and administration. The school will provide opportunities for families to participate in school events, parent meetings, workshops, and other activities that strengthen the connection between home and school. ACSMS will also collaborate with community organizations and local partners to provide resources, programs, and additional support for students and families. Through open communication, accessibility, and shared decision-making, the school will encourage parents and community stakeholders to remain active partners in promoting student achievement and overall school success.

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)).

ACSMS will strengthen its academic program through targeted, data-driven instruction in ELA, mathematics, and 5th grade science, with an emphasis on students in the lowest 25th percentile. Teachers will use assessment and progress-monitoring data to provide differentiated small-group instruction, intervention, and enrichment. The school will increase learning time by offering free after-school tutoring for students needing additional support. In 5th grade science, instruction will emphasize standards-based lessons, spiraling previously taught content, hands-on learning, and rigorous, higher-order tasks. Ongoing data analysis and progress monitoring will be used to adjust instruction and increase student proficiency.

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)).

The school's plan is closely aligned to the MDCPS district programs offered for Title 1 recipients. The school complies with district program practices and deadlines to ensure our parents receive updated information on the benefits that they have access to. Our teachers have been trained to identify students and/or families in need of additional support within the community and school.

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)).

The school provides a full-time counselor for academic and social emotional assistance. In addition to our counselor, mental health services are provided and monitored through our collaboration with the district's designated mental health counselor who is at the school site two days a week. When necessary, students and families are referred to outside services to assist with their needs.

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)).

Our students receive assemblies and individual counseling meetings related to high school readiness and career planning. Students are provided an assessment that analyzes their personality and interests based on their responses to identify possible career paths. Students are made aware of high school magnet programs available through the district school and academies that may be available by local charter schools.

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)).

While the school implements a positive behavior system, inappropriate behaviors are approached with a discipline process that is school wide. Behavior expectations have been presented to students at the beginning of the school year, and are consistently reviewed by teachers to ensure students are aware of unwelcomed behaviors and the consequences that may follow.

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)).

Teachers will be provided multiple avenues of professional development. Teachers will participate in data literacy trainings, collaborative learning communities, differentiated instruction workshops, coaching and mentoring programs, technology integration training, and subject-specific professional development. Teacher retention is essential for establishing meaningful connections between staff and students, as well as establishing familiarity and norms. To increase teacher retention, the administrative team will use incentives and support for high-need subjects, promote career advancement opportunities, implement positive school culture initiatives, create flexible work arrangements, and obtain recruitment partnerships with local colleges and universities.

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)).

The administrative team establishes and maintains relationships with local pre-schools to support instructional decision making. The school provides opportunities for families to gain knowledge of the programs and options available for their child as they transition from pre-school to kindergarten.

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