

The School District of Palm Beach County

SOUTH TECH ACADEMY



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 3

 C. Demographic Data..... 9

 D. Early Warning Systems 10

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 13

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 14

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 15

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 16

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 17

 E. Grade Level Data Review 20

III. Planning for Improvement..... 21

IV. Positive Learning Environment 38

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 43

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 51

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 54

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

SouthTech Academy's core mission is to graduate students prepared for work, higher education, and productive citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement

SouthTech Academy has a legacy of service and a history of success. As an Area Vocational/ Technical Center a reputation was established within the community. The local economy was strengthened as adults and high school students cycled through programs and entered the workforce. Local politics diverted those programs away from SouthTech in 1998, and the school began a three-year transformation into a Career Academy Center that provided academics and career training for high school students during the day and career enhancement training for adults after the high school day ended. During FY03 the District decided to close SouthTech at the end of FY04.

In late FY03, the School Advisory Council, principal, staff, students, parents, and other stakeholders decided that the school's value to students and the community at large more than justified whatever investment was needed for redemption. Florida Statutes provide a process for converting a District school to a charter school. The process required several months of time and a great deal of work, but allows a conversion charter school to operate under a local governing board under the control of State statutes, but free of District policy. A Founding Board of dedicated individuals was formed, community and business support was recruited, and South Technical Community High School was effectively converted to SouthTech Charter High School on July 1, 2004. SouthTech Academy became the new name effective July 1, 2005. At today's SouthTech Academy, the Career Academy concept has been retained and will continue to expand into additional high wage/high demand areas in the future. In addition, continual emphasis will be placed on increasing academic excellence while providing state-of-the-art career education.

SouthTech is postured to become a national model. A part of this posturing may be attributed to the unique nature of programs, but the level of dedication and support that exists among all stakeholders along with the huge demand for SouthTech's product assures the organization that significance as a national model is both realistic and attainable. The goal of SouthTech Academy is to convert the possibility of national educational significance into reality. The key to achievement of the goal is excellence. The vision focuses on production of educational excellence that justifies and deserves

national acclaim. Leadership seeks to enable the existing dedication and high levels of available support to attain optimum results. At the high school level, optimum results develop students prepared for work, higher education, and productive citizenship.

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

Carla Lovett

carla.lovett@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

Executive Director

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Carla Lovett administers the budget, creates a positive culture for students, employees and families, improves school leadership, and creates the long-term plans for the success of SouthTech students and the school itself. She strives to create positive relationships between SouthTech and the community it supports, working with business and community leaders to bring the best opportunities to SouthTech students.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Nicole Handy

nicole.handy@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

Director of Growth and Expansion

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Director of Growth and Expansion is responsible for identifying, evaluating, and pursuing strategic opportunities to broaden SouthTech School's reach and impact, with a primary focus on increasing access to high-quality Career and Technical Education (CTE) for students. This includes leading efforts to open new campuses and establish satellite programs both statewide and nationwide, ensuring each location is strategically placed to serve diverse student populations and meet local workforce needs. The Director will research emerging industry trends, labor market demands, and educational innovations to guide program development and campus planning. They will cultivate and maintain partnerships with business leaders, community organizations, governmental agencies, and educational institutions to create pathways that connect students to relevant, in-demand career opportunities. Duties include conducting market analyses, preparing feasibility studies, developing proposals, and overseeing the planning, design, and launch of new campuses or schools.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Joshua Wigelsworth

joshua.wigelsworth@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Joshua Wigelsworth oversees all of the operations of SouthTech Academy including SIP implementation on a school-wide scale. He also provides support to the instructional coaches and assistant principals as needed while revising policies and procedures as needed and assessing teaching methods.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Erin Kurtz

erin.kurtz@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Erin Kurtz oversees academic teachers, ensuring that the SIP is implemented and students are challenged with a rigorous curriculum in all of their courses. She monitors student achievement and tracks the graduation status of every student, ensuring the highest graduation rate possible. She is

also the ESP leader, ensuring a nurturing and supportive environment for our new teachers.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Joseph Roberts

joseph.roberts@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Joseph Roberts tracks student disciplinary referrals and implements the Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports (PBIS) Program. In addition, he is responsible for coordinating and communicating information regarding the Response to Intervention and oversees the ESE department.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Meghan Hess

meghan.hess-shamdasani@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

CTE Coordinator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Meghan Hess is the head of all career academies at SouthTech. She works with community partners to offer on-the-job opportunities for our students and works with SouthTech instructors towards the goal of every student graduating with an advanced certification.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Kristen Markevich

kristen.markevich@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

Assessment & Compliance Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Kristen Markevich acts as the testing manager, federal grant administrator, and ensures compliance with all district, state and national policies.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Jonelle Breault

jonelle.breault@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

Math Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Jonelle Breault serves as an instructional leader for the math department, spearheading on-campus tutorial efforts and data-driven instructional initiatives.

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name

Jill Danegelis

jill.danegelis@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

ESE Coordinator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Jill Dangelis is responsible for tracking support for all students with IEPs to ensure all accommodations are met and ensures IEPs are up-to-date. Her team meets with every student and parent to ensure each child is successful regardless of their circumstances.

Leadership Team Member #10

Employee's Name

Maureen Marin

maureen.marin@pbcharterschools.org

Position Title

504 Coordinator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Maureen Marin is responsible for ensuring all 504s are up-to-date and accommodations are met. Her team meets with every student and parent to their plan gives them the best opportunity to succeed.

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.

Stakeholder feedback, survey results, and school performance data are reviewed collectively to establish SIP priorities, develop measurable goals, select evidence-based strategies, and identify appropriate supports and resources. Stakeholder input is not limited to the initial development of the SIP; feedback is gathered throughout the year and used to monitor progress and make adjustments as necessary. This ongoing process ensures that the SIP reflects the needs and perspectives of the entire school community and supports continuous improvement in student achievement and school outcomes.

Throughout the school year, the school surveys staff, parents/families, and students multiple times to gather feedback regarding academic programs, school climate and culture, student engagement, communication, safety, family involvement, and areas in need of improvement. Survey results are reviewed by the school leadership team and used to identify trends, areas of concern, and priorities that should be addressed through the SIP.

Teachers and school staff provide additional input through faculty meetings, professional learning activities, department and team meetings, and ongoing discussions regarding student achievement and instructional needs. The school leadership team reviews academic, attendance, behavioral, and other relevant school data with staff to identify achievement gaps and determine appropriate strategies and interventions.

As a secondary school, student voice is an important component of the improvement process. In addition to student surveys, students are provided opportunities to share feedback regarding their academic experiences, school climate, engagement, and supports needed for success. Parent and family input is gathered through surveys, meetings, school events, and ongoing communication with school administration and staff.

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 administrative team will conduct monthly accountability meetings to review progress toward SIP goals, analyze current academic, attendance, behavioral, and assessment data, and determine whether implemented strategies are producing the intended outcomes.

A strong emphasis will be placed on monitoring the progress of students demonstrating the greatest achievement gaps. Administrators and instructional staff will review state assessment data, progress-monitoring results, classroom performance, intervention data, and other relevant indicators to identify students and student groups requiring additional support. Data will be disaggregated, as appropriate, to ensure achievement gaps are identified and addressed.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will serve as an additional structure for ongoing SIP monitoring. PLC meetings will concentrate on data analysis, student progress, instructional effectiveness, and the identification of appropriate interventions and enrichment opportunities. All instructional staff will participate in the data-review process, allowing teachers to collaboratively evaluate student performance, share effective instructional practices, and adjust instruction based on demonstrated student needs.

The school will also incorporate goal setting for both staff members and students. Teachers and staff will establish measurable goals aligned with schoolwide SIP priorities and student achievement needs. Students will be encouraged to review their own performance data, establish individual academic goals, and monitor their progress throughout the year. This process promotes shared accountability and helps students take an active role in their academic growth.

Stakeholder feedback will remain an important component of SIP monitoring and revision. Feedback from staff, students, parents and families, and community stakeholders, including information collected through surveys administered multiple times throughout the year, will be reviewed alongside student achievement data. When monitoring indicates that a strategy is not producing sufficient progress, particularly for students with the greatest achievement gaps, the leadership team will work with stakeholders to identify needed changes, revise strategies or supports, and monitor the impact of those adjustments.

Through monthly administrative accountability meetings, PLC data reviews, staff and student goal setting, ongoing progress monitoring, and stakeholder feedback, the school will maintain a continuous cycle of planning, implementation, evaluation, and revision to ensure the SIP remains responsive to student needs and supports continuous improvement in meeting Florida's state academic standards.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	SENIOR HIGH 9-12
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	84.1%
CHARTER SCHOOL	YES
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)* WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2025-26: A 2024-25: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: B

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

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

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

Current Year (2026-27)

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL				TOTAL
	9	10	11	12	
School Enrollment	217	266	234	341	1,058
Absent 10% or more school days	19	28	38	61	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	12	7	27
Course failure in Math	0	45	4	1	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	12	31	22	83	148
Level 1 on statewide Algebra assessment	9	11	27	98	145

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
	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	26	15	28	71

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL				TOTAL
	9	10	11	12	
Absent 10% or more school days					0
One or more suspensions					0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)					0
Course failure in Math					0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					0
Level 1 on statewide Algebra assessment					0

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

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

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

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL				TOTAL
	9	10	11	12	
Retained students: current year					0
Students retained two or more times					0

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

Data for 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]
ELA Achievement*	64	65	62	61	62	59	48	58	55
Grade 3 ELA Achievement									
ELA Learning Gains	55	60	59	60	59	58	50	60	57
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58	57	55	60	58	56	48	59	55
Math Achievement*	68	54	52	73	50	49	71	45	45
Math Learning Gains	50	44	45	67	46	47	61	46	47
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52	43	44	78	47	49	59	48	49
Science Achievement	86	78	74	88	77	72	76	71	68
Social Studies Achievement*	88	77	76	81	73	75	71	71	71
Graduation Rate	100	95	94	99	93	92	97	91	90
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration	99	75	74	99	71	69	98	71	67
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					49	52		42	49

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPi) than in school grades calculation.

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

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

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

2025-26 ESSA FPPI						
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)						ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students						72%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students						No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target						1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI						721
Total Components for the FPPI						10
Percent Tested						100%
Graduation Rate						100%
ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
72%	76%	69%	65%	55%	47%	

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	61%	No		
English Language Learners	69%	No		
Asian Students	79%	No		
Black/African American Students	73%	No		
Hispanic Students	72%	No		
Multiracial Students	33%	Yes	1	
White Students	74%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	No		

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2025-26 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2024-25	C&C ACCEL 2024-25	ELP PROGRESS
	All Students	64%		55%	58%	69%	50%	52%	86%	88%	100%	99%	
	Students With Disabilities	26%		41%	43%	62%	52%	50%	60%	79%	100%	100%	
	English Language Learners	42%		51%	58%	67%	48%	63%	80%	76%	100%	100%	
	Asian Students	86%		71%									
	Black/African American Students	66%		55%	70%	67%	47%	49%	88%	91%	100%	100%	
	Hispanic Students	62%		56%	52%	72%	52%	57%	84%	85%	100%	98%	
	Multiracial Students	45%		20%									
	White Students	60%		51%	47%	68%	59%		91%	94%	100%	100%	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students	62%		57%	57%	67%	52%	51%	84%	85%	100%	100%	
	09/2026												

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	ELF PROGR
All Students	61%		60%	60%	73%	67%	78%	88%	81%		99%	99%	73%
Students With Disabilities	38%		56%	52%	62%	67%		81%	60%		97%	100%	
English Language Learners	44%		58%	57%	72%	67%	100%	77%	52%		96%	100%	73%
Black/African American Students	60%		61%	66%	78%	67%	95%	88%	83%		99%	100%	
Hispanic Students	61%		58%	56%	68%	69%	70%	87%	80%		98%	99%	
White Students	63%		56%	42%	63%	53%		94%	79%		100%	100%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	61%		59%	62%	73%	65%	81%	87%	81%		99%	99%	

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	48%		50%	48%	71%	61%	59%	76%	71%		97%	98%	81%
Students With Disabilities	21%		36%	42%	68%	59%		65%	35%		95%	95%	
English Language Learners	25%		43%	45%	55%	50%	60%	72%	38%		100%	95%	81%
Black/African American Students	48%		53%	55%	76%	66%	63%	82%	70%		98%	99%	73%
Hispanic Students	47%		48%	44%	65%	57%	54%	70%	69%		96%	97%	
White Students	43%		44%	43%	74%	64%		69%	86%		100%	96%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	47%		52%	50%	72%	64%	61%	75%	69%		97%	98%	82%

Printed: 09/09/2026

Page 19 of 55

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

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

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

2025-26 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	9	60%	60%	0%	60%	0%
ELA	10	68%	65%	3%	61%	7%
Biology	10	75%	66%	9%	60%	15%
Algebra	9	66%	42%	24%	41%	25%
Geometry	9	94%	78%	16%	75%	19%
Geometry	10	65%	42%	23%	40%	25%
Geometry	11	38%	29%	9%	26%	12%
History	11	87%	77%	10%	75%	12%
Algebra	10	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Algebra	11	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
Geometry	12	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
History	12	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Most Improvement

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

ELA Achievement showed the most significant sustained improvement, increasing from 48% in 2024 to 61% in 2025 and 64% in 2026, representing a 16-percentage-point increase over the three-year period.

To support improvement in this area, the school increased its focus on data-driven instruction and progress monitoring. Teachers regularly analyzed student performance data through PLCs to identify individual strengths, skill deficits, and students requiring additional support. Instruction was adjusted based on assessment results, with targeted interventions and small-group instruction provided to students who had not yet demonstrated mastery of grade-level standards.

The school also increased student ownership of achievement through individual goal setting and data review. Students were provided opportunities to understand their assessment results, establish academic goals, and monitor their progress throughout the year. Teachers used ongoing assessment data to provide targeted remediation and monitor whether students were progressing toward those goals.

Additionally, the administrative team incorporated student achievement into monthly accountability meetings, allowing school leaders to regularly review progress, identify achievement gaps, and work with instructional staff to adjust strategies when students were not demonstrating expected growth. The combination of frequent data analysis, targeted instruction, PLC collaboration, student goal setting, and administrative monitoring contributed to the sustained improvement in ELA achievement.

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 ELA Achievement was a strength overall, ELA Achievement for Students with Disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest performance and represents the school's most significant achievement gap. In 2025–26, only 26% of Students with Disabilities demonstrated ELA proficiency, compared with 64% of all students. SWD ELA Learning Gains were also low at 41%, compared with 55% schoolwide.

Several factors contributed to this performance. Data analysis indicated a need for more consistent targeted and differentiated instruction based on individual student skill deficits, particularly for

students requiring intensive reading support. The school also identified a need to strengthen the connection between progress-monitoring data, classroom instruction, interventions, and individual student goals. Additionally, ensuring that accommodations and specialized instructional strategies are implemented consistently across content areas remains an area of focus.

The three-year trend demonstrates both progress and continued variability. SWD ELA Achievement increased from 21% in 2023–24 to 38% in 2024–25, before declining to 26% in 2025–26. Similarly, SWD ELA Learning Gains increased from 36% to 56% before decreasing to 41%. This fluctuation indicates that previous strategies demonstrated the ability to produce improvement but were not yet sufficiently consistent or sustainable to maintain that growth.

Moving forward, the school will increase its focus on Students with Disabilities through data-focused PLCs, targeted small-group and individualized instruction, frequent progress monitoring, student goal setting, and monthly administrative accountability meetings. Student data will be reviewed regularly to determine whether interventions are producing adequate growth, and instructional strategies will be adjusted when students are not progressing as expected. Closing the ELA achievement gap for Students with Disabilities will remain a priority within the SIP.

Greatest Decline

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

Math Learning Gains among the Lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year, decreasing from 78% in 2024–25 to 52% in 2025–26, representing a 26-percentage-point decline. Overall Math Learning Gains also decreased from 67% to 50%, indicating that student growth in mathematics is an area requiring increased attention despite the school's continued strong overall Math Achievement.

Several factors contributed to this decline. Analysis of student performance indicated a need for more frequent progress monitoring and earlier identification of students who were not demonstrating expected growth. While overall mathematics proficiency remained strong, the data suggest that instructional practices were more successful at helping students achieve proficiency than at ensuring consistent year-to-year growth for all students, particularly those in the Lowest 25%.

The school also identified a need to strengthen the use of individual student data within PLCs, provide more targeted interventions based on specific skill deficits, and increase student ownership through individual academic goal setting and progress monitoring. Variations in individual student needs and the level of support required by students entering the year below grade level also contributed to the challenge of maintaining the exceptionally high learning gains achieved during the prior year.

In response, the school will implement additional targeted support for students identified within the Lowest 25%. The Math Coach will conduct regularly scheduled small-group pull-out sessions with Lowest 25% students, using assessment and progress-monitoring data to identify specific skill deficits

and provide targeted, standards-aligned instruction. Student groupings and instructional focus will be adjusted throughout the year based on individual progress and demonstrated needs.

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.

Based on the 2025–26 accountability data, the school performed at or above the state average in every reported schoolwide accountability component. Therefore, there was not a negative performance gap between the school and the state. ELA Achievement had the smallest positive difference, with 64% of students demonstrating proficiency compared with the state average of 62%, a difference of only 2 percentage points.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Attendance is an area of concern within the traditional high school population. The data show 19 Grade 9 students, 28 Grade 10 students, and 38 Grade 11 students with attendance below 90%. The system initially identifies 61 Grade 12 students with attendance below 90%; however, this figure includes students participating in SouthTech Academy's Transition Program. The Grade 12 attendance data should therefore be interpreted with caution. SouthTech Academy's Transition Program serves students with disabilities ages 18–22 who have deferred receipt of their high school diplomas and continue to receive transition services. These students are not enrolled in traditional general education classes and are often scheduled to attend only on designated days, even though they remain enrolled in a course for reporting purposes. Additionally, Transition Program students may elect to accept their diploma and exit the program during the school year. These circumstances can cause their attendance to be reflected inaccurately when calculated using traditional daily attendance expectations. When Transition Program students are removed from the Grade 12 attendance calculation, only 23 traditional Grade 12 students have attendance below 90%, rather than the 61 students reflected in the initial Early Warning System data. This adjusted figure provides a more accurate representation of attendance among SouthTech Academy's traditional senior population.

Mathematics Achievement is also an area of concern for SouthTech Academy. The data show that 45 Grade 10 students experienced a mathematics course failure, representing approximately 17% of the Grade 10 population (45 of 266 students). In addition, 27 Grade 11 students were identified as Level 1 on the state mathematics assessment, indicating continued need for targeted support in mathematics.

Many of these students fall within the school's Lowest 25%, which has already been identified as a specific Area of Focus within this School Improvement Plan. As a result, SouthTech Academy will continue to prioritize mathematics intervention for these students through targeted small-group

instruction, differentiated supports, progress monitoring, data-driven instructional adjustments, and additional academic interventions designed to increase proficiency and learning gains among the Lowest 25%.

Highest Priorities

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

1. ELA Achievement and Growth for Students with Disabilities (SWD)

Students with Disabilities represent the school's most significant ELA achievement gap. Only 26% of SWD students demonstrated ELA proficiency, compared with 64% of all students. SWD students also demonstrated only 41% ELA Learning Gains and 43% Learning Gains among the Lowest 25%. Increasing ELA achievement and growth for this subgroup will be a primary school improvement priority through targeted intervention, differentiated instruction, appropriate accommodations, and frequent progress monitoring.

2. ELA Learning Gains for Multiracial Students

Multiracial Students demonstrated 45% ELA Achievement and 20% ELA Learning Gains, indicating a need for targeted attention to the academic growth of this subgroup. It is important to note that the school had a relatively small population of 27 Multiracial Students, meaning the performance of a small number of individual students can have a substantial impact on the subgroup's overall percentage. While the small subgroup size should be considered when interpreting year-to-year fluctuations, the data still warrant focused attention. The school will review individual student-level data to identify specific skill deficits, establish individual academic goals, provide targeted instructional support, and closely monitor the progress of each student within this subgroup.

3. Math Learning Gains, Particularly for the Lowest 25%

Although overall Math Achievement remains strong at 69%, Math Learning Gains were only 50%, and Math Learning Gains among the Lowest 25% were 52%. This represents a significant decline from the prior year. The school will increase targeted mathematics intervention, including Math Coach pull-out groups for students within the Lowest 25%, frequent progress monitoring, data-driven grouping, and coordination between the Math Coach and classroom teachers.

4. ELA Achievement for English Language Learners (ELLs)

ELA Achievement among English Language Learners was 42%, compared with 64% schoolwide, representing a 22-percentage-point achievement gap. The school will focus on targeted literacy support, language-rich instructional strategies, differentiation, appropriate ELL supports, and regular monitoring of both academic achievement and English language development.

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

The school's primary Area of Focus for the 2026–27 school year is to increase ELA achievement and learning gains for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades 9–10, with continued literacy support and progress monitoring for SWD students across all high school grade levels.

Analysis of 2025–26 accountability data identified a significant achievement gap between Students with Disabilities and the overall student population. Only 26% of Students with Disabilities demonstrated ELA proficiency compared with 64% of all students, representing a 38-percentage-point achievement gap. Additionally, SWD students demonstrated 41% ELA Learning Gains and 43% ELA Learning Gains among the Lowest 25%.

Prior-year trends further demonstrate the need for focused intervention. SWD ELA Achievement increased from 21% in 2023–24 to 38% in 2024–25, but declined to 26% in 2025–26. SWD ELA Learning Gains similarly increased from 36% to 56% before declining to 41%. The variability in performance indicates that previous strategies have demonstrated the potential to improve student outcomes but have not yet resulted in consistent, sustained growth.

Low ELA proficiency affects students' ability to successfully access grade-level content across all subject areas and can negatively impact performance on state assessments, course completion, graduation readiness, and postsecondary preparation. Therefore, increasing ELA achievement and learning gains for Students with Disabilities has been identified as a crucial school improvement 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.

In 2025–26, 26% of Students with Disabilities demonstrated ELA proficiency, 41% demonstrated ELA Learning Gains, and 43% of SWD students within the Lowest 25% demonstrated ELA Learning Gains.

By the end of the 2026–27 school year, the school will:

- Increase SWD ELA Achievement from 26% to at least 31%.
- Increase SWD ELA Learning Gains from 41% to at least 45%.
- Increase ELA Learning Gains for SWD students within the Lowest 25% from 43% to at least 48%.

Progress toward these outcomes will be measured through state assessment results and monitored throughout the year using FAST progress-monitoring data, classroom assessments, intervention data, student work, and other standards-aligned assessments.

Midyear progress will be monitored by comparing FAST Progress Monitoring 1 (PM1) and Progress Monitoring 2 (PM2) mathematics assessment results for students identified within the Lowest 25%. The midyear goal is to demonstrate measurable academic growth by reducing the number of students scoring at Level 1 by at least 5% and reducing the number of students scoring at Level 2 by at least 5%, reflecting movement toward Level 3 proficiency or higher. Students who do not demonstrate expected growth between PM1 and PM2 will be identified for additional targeted intervention, progress monitoring, and instructional support.

Midyear Evidence of Teacher Implementation:

By the FAST PM2 assessment window, ELA and ESE teachers will have documented baseline data, individualized reading/ELA goals, student data conferences, intervention supports, and progress-monitoring records for 75% of Students with Disabilities. Teachers will also document instructional adjustments for students not demonstrating expected progress based on FAST, Achieve3000, classroom assessment, student work, and IEP progress data.

End-of-Year Evidence of Teacher Implementation:

By the end of the 2026–27 school year, ELA and ESE teachers will maintain a complete data cycle for 95% of Students with Disabilities, including baseline performance, individualized goals, intervention strategies, ongoing progress monitoring, instructional adjustments, student data conferences, and end-of-year review. Evidence will demonstrate that teachers consistently used student data to plan, monitor, and adjust instruction throughout the school year.

Monitoring

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

Implementation and impact will be monitored through a structured cycle of monthly administrative accountability meetings, data-focused PLCs, and individual student progress monitoring.

Following each FAST progress-monitoring administration and other common assessments, ELA teachers, ESE staff, instructional coaches, and administration will disaggregate student performance data to specifically review the progress of Students with Disabilities. Individual students who are not

demonstrating expected growth will be identified, and instructional strategies, interventions, accommodations, and student groupings will be adjusted based on demonstrated need. PLCs will review student performance by benchmark and standard, identify areas of strength and deficiency, and develop targeted instructional responses. Students will also participate in individual academic goal setting and data review to increase ownership of their academic progress. The administrative team will review implementation and student outcomes during monthly accountability meetings. Particular attention will be given to whether students receiving targeted interventions are demonstrating accelerated growth and whether the achievement gap between SWD students and the overall student population is narrowing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kristen Markevich

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:

The school will implement a multi-tiered, data-driven literacy intervention model incorporating explicit and systematic literacy instruction, differentiated small-group instruction, Achieve3000 assessment and instructional data, and frequent progress monitoring for Students with Disabilities. Students will complete Achieve3000 assessments at designated intervals throughout the school year to provide teachers with additional diagnostic and progress-monitoring information regarding reading performance and Lexile growth. Teachers will analyze Achieve3000 results in conjunction with FAST, classroom assessments, IEP goals, and student work to identify individual strengths and specific areas requiring additional instruction. Assessment results will be used to create and adjust data-driven small groups and individualized interventions. Instruction will include explicit modeling, guided practice, vocabulary development, comprehension strategies, frequent opportunities for student response and feedback, and targeted support with increasingly complex text. Students demonstrating significant skill deficits or insufficient growth will receive additional small-group or individualized intervention beyond core classroom instruction. ESE and general education teachers will collaborate to ensure that accommodations, specially designed instruction, and instructional supports identified through students' IEPs are consistently implemented. Student response to intervention will be evaluated using multiple data sources, including Achieve3000 assessment/Lexile growth, FAST progress monitoring, classroom assessments, intervention data, and student work. Intervention intensity, instructional strategies, and student groupings will be adjusted when the data indicate insufficient progress.

Rationale:

The intervention was selected because school data demonstrate that Students with Disabilities require more intensive and individualized literacy support. The combination of explicit instruction, differentiated small-group intervention, and frequent assessment provides teachers with timely information to identify skill deficits and modify instruction. Achieve3000 provides an additional source of ongoing reading-performance data between state assessment windows, allowing teachers and administrators to monitor individual student growth more frequently and determine whether targeted

interventions are producing the desired results.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Structured Discussion and Collaborative Comprehension of Complex Text Teachers will provide structured opportunities for Students with Disabilities to engage in meaningful discussion of grade-level literary and informational text. Students will use text-dependent questions, evidence-based responses, collaborative discussion, graphic organizers, annotation, and writing in response to reading to strengthen comprehension and critical thinking. Teachers will explicitly model expectations for academic discussion and provide appropriate scaffolds, sentence frames, visual supports, chunking, graphic organizers, and other IEP-aligned accommodations as needed. Scaffolds will be gradually reduced as students demonstrate increased independence. Monitoring: Teachers will monitor student participation, comprehension, written responses, formative assessment results, and student work to determine whether students are increasingly able to comprehend and respond to complex grade-level text independently. Results will be reviewed during PLCs and used to adjust instructional scaffolds and supports.

Rationale:

Structured discussion is an appropriate evidence-based intervention for Students with Disabilities because it provides repeated, scaffolded opportunities for students to process grade-level text, explain their thinking, respond to text-dependent questions, and support their ideas with evidence. Students with Disabilities may experience difficulty with reading comprehension, academic vocabulary, organizing ideas, and expressing understanding independently. Structured discussion allows teachers to explicitly model these skills and provide supports such as sentence stems, graphic organizers, guided questioning, visual supports, and peer interaction. Through structured discussion, students actively engage with complex literary and informational text rather than simply completing reading assignments independently. Teachers can use questioning and discussion to identify misunderstandings in real time, provide immediate corrective feedback, clarify vocabulary and concepts, and deepen students' understanding of the text. The intervention also supports the gradual development of independence. As students become more proficient in discussing, analyzing, and citing evidence from text, instructional scaffolds can be reduced. These skills directly support the demands of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards and statewide ELA assessments, which require students to comprehend complex text, analyze information, make inferences, and use textual evidence to support responses. For Students with Disabilities, structured discussion will be implemented alongside IEP accommodations and specially designed instruction to ensure access to grade-level content while addressing individual learning needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate 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

Baseline Assessment and Individual Student Goal Setting**Person Monitoring:**

ELA Teachers/Admin Team/ESE Teacher

By When/Frequency:

September

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

ELA and ESE staff will review prior-year state assessment data, FAST PM #1 data, Achieve3000 baseline assessment/Lexile data, IEP information, classroom performance, and other diagnostic information to identify the specific literacy needs of each Student with a Disability.

Individual student goals will be established based on baseline performance. Students will participate in reviewing their data and monitoring progress toward their academic and reading-growth goals.

Impact will be measured by comparing subsequent FAST and Achieve3000 performance with each student's baseline and established growth goals.

Action Step #2

Monitor SWD performance monthly and intensify interventions when students are not demonstrating sufficient growth

Person Monitoring:

School Administration, ESE Coordinator, MTSS Coordinator, ELA/Reading Teachers, and ESE Teachers

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

SWD achievement and learning-gain data will be reviewed during PLCs and monthly accountability meetings. Staff will examine FAST data, classroom assessments, intervention progress-monitoring data, course performance, student work, and IEP progress to determine the effectiveness of interventions. Students who are not demonstrating expected progress will receive adjusted or intensified intervention through the MTSS process, which may include increased instructional time, increased intervention frequency, smaller instructional groups, additional explicit instruction, or revised instructional strategies.

Area of Focus #2

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Multiracial Students (MUL)**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 school will focus on improving English Language Arts achievement and learning gains among Multiracial students. During the 2025–26 school year, the school served only 27 students identified as Multiracial; however, the academic performance of this subgroup was significant enough to contribute to the school being identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI).

In 2025–26, only 45% of Multiracial students demonstrated proficiency in ELA, compared with 64% of all students. Of particular concern, only 20% of Multiracial students demonstrated an ELA learning

gain, compared with 55% of all students. This represents a 35-percentage-point gap in learning gains between Multiracial students and the All Students group.

Although the Multiracial subgroup represents a relatively small portion of the school's overall student population, the data demonstrate a significant and persistent need for targeted support. Because the performance of this subgroup resulted in ATSI identification, improving outcomes for Multiracial students will be a priority within the school's continuous improvement efforts.

The school will use individual student-level data to identify specific academic needs and ensure that each Multiracial student is closely monitored throughout the school year. FAST assessment data, Achieve3000 assessments and performance data, classroom assessments, student work, and teacher-developed formative assessments will be used to identify skill deficits and determine appropriate instructional interventions.

Instructional strategies will include differentiated small-group instruction, explicit instruction in reading comprehension and vocabulary, standards-based intervention, targeted remediation, and increased opportunities for students to engage with grade-level complex text. Students who do not demonstrate adequate progress will receive additional support through the school's MTSS/intervention process.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2026–27 school year, the percentage of Multiracial students demonstrating proficiency in ELA will increase from 45% to at least 55%, and the percentage of Multiracial students demonstrating an ELA learning gain will increase from 20% to at least 50%, as measured by the Florida statewide ELA assessment.

The school will also work to reduce the achievement and learning-gain gaps between Multiracial students and the All Students group, with the goal of improving subgroup performance sufficiently to address the conditions that contributed to the school's ATSI identification.

Midyear progress toward the ELA goal for Multiracial students will be monitored by comparing FAST Progress Monitoring 1 (PM1) and Progress Monitoring 2 (PM2) results. The school's midyear goal is to demonstrate measurable growth within the subgroup by reducing the number of Multiracial students scoring at Level 1 by at least 5% and reducing the number of Multiracial students scoring at Level 2 by at least 5%, with corresponding movement toward Levels 3, 4, and 5.

Midyear Evidence of Teacher Implementation

By the midyear review, ELA teachers will have identified and documented the literacy needs of at least 75% of Multiracial students using state assessment data, FAST progress-monitoring data, Achieve3000 data, classroom performance, and other available student-level information. Teachers

will implement targeted evidence-based literacy interventions, including explicit comprehension instruction, vocabulary development, structured text discussion, and differentiated small-group instruction. Teachers will also document student progress and any instructional or intervention adjustments made in response to data.

End-of-Year Evidence of Teacher Implementation

By the end of the 2026–27 school year, ELA teachers will maintain a complete instructional cycle for at least 95% of Multiracial students that includes identification of individual literacy needs, implementation of targeted evidence-based interventions, ongoing progress monitoring, and documented instructional adjustments based on student response. Evidence will demonstrate that teachers consistently used student-level data to determine when interventions should be continued, modified, intensified, or replaced.

Monitoring

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

Because the Multiracial subgroup consisted of only 27 students during the 2025–26 school year, the school will use a highly individualized monitoring approach that allows instructional staff and school leadership to closely track the progress of each student within the subgroup.

The school leadership team and instructional staff will monitor Multiracial students using FAST progress-monitoring assessments, Achieve3000 assessments and performance data, classroom formative and summative assessments, student work samples, teacher-created assessments, attendance, course performance, and intervention data.

Student performance will be reviewed during PLC meetings and monthly accountability meetings. During these reviews, staff will identify individual students who are not demonstrating expected progress, analyze specific standards and skill deficits, and determine whether instructional strategies or interventions should be adjusted.

Teachers will provide differentiated small-group instruction, targeted remediation, standards-based intervention, and individualized support based on identified student needs. Students who do not demonstrate sufficient progress will receive increasingly intensive support through the MTSS process. School leadership will specifically monitor the Multiracial subgroup throughout each FAST progress-monitoring window and compare subgroup achievement and learning gains with the All Students group. Data will be used to determine whether achievement gaps are narrowing and whether implemented strategies are having the intended impact.

Given the school's ATSI identification related to this subgroup, progress toward improved outcomes for Multiracial students will be reviewed regularly with the school leadership team and relevant stakeholders. Strategies and interventions will be revised as necessary to ensure continuous improvement and increased academic achievement for students within the subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kristen Markevich

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 and Systematic Literacy Instruction

Rationale:

The school will implement explicit and systematic literacy instruction to improve reading comprehension, vocabulary, and students' ability to analyze increasingly complex text. Teachers will provide direct instruction and modeling of reading comprehension strategies, explicit vocabulary instruction, think-alouds, guided practice, frequent checks for understanding, text-dependent questioning, and gradual release of responsibility. Instruction will target specific skill deficits identified through FAST, classroom assessments, student work, and other available data. Particular attention will be given to helping students determine central ideas, identify and analyze textual evidence, develop academic vocabulary, monitor comprehension, and comprehend complex literary and informational text. Monitoring: Implementation and student response will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, PLC data reviews, common formative assessments, student work, FAST progress-monitoring results, and monthly accountability meetings. Student performance data will be used to determine whether instructional strategies need to be adjusted or intensified.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Targeted Small-Group Literacy Intervention Using Evidence-Based Comprehension Practices

Rationale:

Students demonstrating identified reading deficiencies will receive targeted, differentiated small-group literacy instruction. Small groups will be formed based on specific standards and skill deficits rather than solely on overall achievement level. Instruction will incorporate evidence-based comprehension-building practices, including building vocabulary and background knowledge, questioning, determining the gist or central idea of text, monitoring comprehension, analyzing evidence, and providing scaffolded opportunities to read and respond to increasingly complex text. Student groupings will remain flexible and will be adjusted as students demonstrate mastery or as new instructional needs are identified. Monitoring: Teachers will monitor student performance through formative assessments, FAST data, classroom assessments, student work, and intervention data. PLC teams will review student progress and modify groupings, instructional focus, frequency, or intensity based on student response. Multiracial students will be reviewed individually during monthly accountability meetings to ensure that students who are not demonstrating expected growth receive additional or intensified support.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Achieve3000 Literacy

Rationale:

Achieve3000 Literacy will be used as a supplemental evidence-based literacy intervention to provide differentiated reading instruction and practice based on students' individual Lexile levels and identified literacy needs. The program provides differentiated informational text, vocabulary development, comprehension activities, writing opportunities, and ongoing assessment data that allow teachers to target instruction and monitor student growth. Teachers will use Achieve3000 in conjunction with standards-aligned classroom instruction rather than as a stand-alone replacement for core ELA instruction. Student performance data will be used to identify areas of need and provide targeted practice in reading comprehension, vocabulary, analysis of informational text, and written response. Monitoring: Teachers and school leadership will monitor Achieve3000 usage, activity completion, assessment performance, Lexile growth, and student performance on assigned activities. Achieve3000 data will be reviewed alongside FAST progress-monitoring data, classroom assessments, course performance, and student work during PLC and monthly accountability meetings. Students who are not demonstrating adequate progress will receive adjusted or intensified instructional support.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Identify and monitor Multiracial students individually using student-level data.

Person Monitoring:

Kristen Markevich

By When/Frequency:

09/25/2026

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

At the beginning of the school year and following each FAST progress-monitoring window, the school will review FAST, Achieve3000, classroom assessment, course performance, and prior-year achievement data for each Multiracial student. Students will be identified for targeted support based on specific standards and skill deficits, and an individual progress-monitoring tracker will be maintained and reviewed during monthly accountability meetings.

Action Step #2

Implement targeted evidence-based literacy instruction and intervention. (provide the intervention)

Person Monitoring:

ELA Teachers

By When/Frequency:

Throughout year - meet monthly

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

ELA teachers will provide explicit and systematic literacy instruction, differentiated small-group

instruction, and targeted remediation based on identified student needs. Achieve3000 will be used as a supplemental literacy intervention to provide differentiated reading practice, comprehension support, vocabulary development, and ongoing assessment data. Students not demonstrating adequate growth will receive increased frequency or intensity of intervention through the MTSS process.

Action Step #3

Review student progress and adjust interventions based on response to instruction. (Monitor and Adjust)

Person Monitoring:
Accountability Team

By When/Frequency:
Monthly

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

Multiracial student performance will be reviewed during PLC meetings and monthly accountability meetings. Staff will analyze FAST, Achieve3000, formative assessment, course performance, and intervention data to determine whether students are on track to meet proficiency and learning-gain goals. For students not demonstrating expected progress, instructional strategies, group size, intervention frequency, duration, or intensity will be adjusted.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Although overall Math Achievement remained strong, math Learning Gains dropped significantly from 78% in 2024–25 to 50% in 2025–26. Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% were only 52%.

The subgroup declines are especially important:

- Black/African American students: 95% → 47%
- English Language Learners: 100% → 48%
- Hispanic students: 70% → 52%
- Economically Disadvantaged students: 81% → 52%

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.

Increase Math Learning Gains from 50% to at least 55% and Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% from 52% to at least 55% during the 2026–27 school year.

Midyear progress toward the mathematics learning-gain goals will be monitored using IXL Diagnostic

data. Students performing two or more grade levels below their current enrolled grade level will be specifically monitored for growth between the beginning-of-year and midyear diagnostic administrations.

The midyear goal is for these students to demonstrate an increase of at least 100 points on the IXL Diagnostic, which represents approximately one grade level of growth. Particular attention will be given to students identified within the Lowest 25% and other students who are significantly below grade-level expectations.

Students who do not demonstrate the expected growth will receive additional goals of increasing Math Learning Gains from 50% to at least 55% and Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% from 52% to at least 55% during the 2026–27 school year. targeted mathematics intervention, differentiated instruction, and progress monitoring. Midyear results will be reviewed to determine whether instructional strategies and interventions are effectively supporting progress toward the school's end-of-year goal.

Midyear Evidence of Teacher Implementation

By the midyear review, mathematics teachers and the Math Coach will have identified students requiring targeted mathematics support and established flexible intervention groups for at least 75% of identified students using prior-year assessment data, common assessments, classroom performance, and other available diagnostic information. Teachers and the Math Coach will implement documented push-in, pull-out, and targeted small-group interventions based on identified standards and skill deficits. Common assessment results will be reviewed during PLCs, and teachers will document reteaching, regrouping, and instructional adjustments based on student response.

End-of-Year Evidence of Teacher Implementation

By the end of the 2026–27 school year, mathematics teachers and the Math Coach will maintain a complete intervention and data-review cycle for at least 95% of identified students, including identification of individual skill deficits, assignment to appropriate intervention groups, implementation of push-in/pull-out or targeted small-group support, common assessment review, reassessment, and documented instructional adjustments.

Evidence will demonstrate that teachers consistently used common assessment and intervention data to determine when students required reteaching, regrouping, intensified support, or a change in instructional strategy.

Monitoring

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

Following each common assessment, mathematics teachers, the Math Coach, and school administration will conduct student-level data reviews to identify standards that have not been

mastered and students who require additional instructional support.

Students will be grouped according to specific skill and standards deficits rather than overall course performance alone. Intervention groups will remain flexible and will be adjusted as students demonstrate mastery or additional needs are identified.

Student progress will also be reviewed during PLC meetings and monthly accountability meetings.

During these meetings, staff will analyze:

- common assessment performance;
- Algebra and Geometry EOC-related assessment data;
- student performance by benchmark/standard;
- Lowest 25% student performance;
- intervention participation and response;
- course grades and classroom performance; and
- evidence of individual student growth.

Students who are not demonstrating sufficient progress will receive adjusted or intensified support.

Adjustments may include additional Math Coach pull-out sessions, increased push-in support, smaller instructional groups, additional instructional time, reteaching using alternative strategies, and targeted intervention through the MTSS process.

School leadership will monitor both overall Mathematics Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% to determine whether the gap between current performance and the school's measurable outcome is decreasing throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jonelle Breault - 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:

Math Coach Push-In and Pull-Out Instruction

Rationale:

The Math Coach will provide targeted push-in and pull-out instructional support based on student performance data and identified standards and skill deficits. During push-in instruction, the Math Coach will collaborate with classroom mathematics teachers to provide additional targeted instruction within the general education classroom. Push-in support may include: targeted small-group reteaching; modeling mathematical problem-solving strategies; addressing prerequisite skill deficits; providing immediate corrective feedback; supporting differentiated instruction; providing additional scaffolding; and assisting students who are not demonstrating mastery of current standards. Students demonstrating significant or persistent skill deficits will receive targeted pull-out intervention from the Math Coach. Pull-out groups will be small, skill-specific, and flexible. Students will receive focused instruction on identified standards and prerequisite skills necessary for success in Algebra and

Geometry. Students will enter and exit pull-out intervention based on assessment data and response to instruction rather than remaining permanently assigned to an intervention group. Monitoring: The Math Coach and mathematics teachers will maintain records of students receiving push-in and pull-out support, skills and standards addressed, frequency of intervention, assessment results, and student response. Common assessments, EOC-aligned assessments, classroom performance, and intervention data will be used to determine whether support should be continued, modified, intensified, or discontinued.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Common Assessment and Data-Driven Instructional Cycle

Rationale:

Mathematics teachers will implement common standards-aligned assessments throughout each instructional unit to identify student mastery and determine instructional next steps. Common assessments will measure priority Florida B.E.S.T. Mathematics Standards and will be administered consistently within applicable mathematics courses. Following each common assessment, mathematics teachers and the Math Coach will analyze results by individual student and standard. The data will be used to identify: students who have mastered the standard; students approaching mastery; students requiring targeted reteaching; students requiring intensive intervention; and standards that require whole-group instructional adjustment. Students who have not demonstrated mastery will receive targeted reteaching and intervention by the math coach, followed by reassessment to determine whether the intervention was effective. The instructional cycle will follow: Assess → Analyze → Identify Skill Deficits → Reteach/Intervene → Reassess → Adjust Instruction Monitoring: Common assessment results will be reviewed during mathematics PLCs and monthly accountability meetings. The Math Coach, along with teachers, will compare initial assessment performance with reassessment results to determine whether students are demonstrating growth and mastery. School leadership will monitor trends among the Lowest 25% and students receiving intervention to determine whether instructional supports are resulting in improved student performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Identify students requiring targeted mathematics support and establish intervention groups.

Person Monitoring:

Jonelle Breault - Math Coach

By When/Frequency:

09/08/2027

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

At the beginning of the school year, mathematics teachers and the Math Coach will review prior-year EOC performance, course data, diagnostic assessments, and other available student achievement data to identify students requiring additional mathematics support. Following each common assessment, intervention groups will be updated based on specific standards and skill deficits. Particular attention will be given to students within the Lowest 25% and students who did not demonstrate a learning gain during the prior year.

Action Step #2

Implement Math Coach push-in/pull-out support and targeted small-group intervention.

Person Monitoring:

Jonelle Breault

By When/Frequency:

Twice a Week

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

The Math Coach will develop and maintain a schedule for push-in classroom support and targeted pull-out intervention. Mathematics teachers and the Math Coach will collaborate to identify the students, standards, and prerequisite skills requiring intervention. Instruction will include explicit modeling, guided practice, corrective feedback, scaffolded problem solving, multiple representations, and frequent checks for understanding. Intervention groups and frequency will be adjusted based on student response.

Action Step #3

Implement a common assessment and data-review cycle

Person Monitoring:

Jonelle Breault

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Mathematics teachers will administer common standards-aligned assessments at identified points throughout each instructional unit. Teachers and the Math Coach will analyze results during PLC meetings, identify students and standards requiring additional support, provide targeted reteaching/intervention, and reassess students to determine mastery. Progress of students within the Lowest 25% will also be reviewed during monthly accountability meetings, with intervention intensified when students are not demonstrating adequate growth.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Other: Increase Student Engagement (Engagement vs. Compliance)

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 school's Positive Learning Environment Area of Focus will center on increasing active student engagement and ownership of learning across all classrooms.

The school has established a generally positive and orderly learning environment in which students

are respectful, polite, and compliant with school and classroom expectations. However, compliance does not necessarily indicate engagement. A student may be quiet, attentive, completing assigned work, or following teacher directions without being actively engaged in the thinking required for meaningful learning.

Therefore, the school's focus will shift from asking, "Are students behaving and completing the task?" to asking, "Are students actively thinking and learning?"

Active engagement will be evident when students are regularly required to think, discuss, question, analyze, problem-solve, collaborate, make connections, explain their reasoning, use evidence, create, and demonstrate understanding rather than primarily listening to instruction or completing tasks passively.

This Area of Focus was identified as an opportunity to strengthen the school's instructional culture and positive learning environment by increasing student voice, academic ownership, and meaningful participation in the learning process.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will serve as the primary structure for improving student engagement. PLC groups will specifically focus on the difference between compliance and cognitive engagement, collaboratively examining instructional practices and identifying strategies that increase the level of student thinking and participation within lessons.

Teachers will use PLC time to plan, implement, reflect upon, and refine high-impact engagement strategies while examining evidence of student learning to determine whether increased participation is resulting in deeper understanding and improved academic performance.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2026–27 school year, increased implementation of active student engagement and cognitive engagement strategies will contribute to improved student learning gains in both ELA and Mathematics.

The school will increase:

- ELA Learning Gains from 55% in 2025–26 to at least 60% in 2026–27, representing an increase of at least 5 percentage points; and
- Mathematics Learning Gains from 50% in 2025–26 to at least 55% in 2026–27, representing an increase of at least 5 percentage points.

Midyear progress will be monitored using multiple data sources aligned to the school's ELA and mathematics goals.

ELA: Progress will be measured by comparing FAST Progress Monitoring 1 (PM1) to Progress Monitoring 2 (PM2) results. The midyear goal is to reduce the number of students scoring at Level 1 by at least 5% and the number of students scoring at Level 2 by at least 5%, demonstrating

movement toward proficiency at Levels 3–5.

Mathematics: Progress will be measured using IXL Diagnostic data, with particular attention to students performing two or more grade levels below their enrolled grade level and students identified within the Lowest 25%. The midyear goal is for these students to demonstrate an increase of at least 100 points on the IXL Diagnostic, representing approximately one grade level of growth.

Midyear Evidence of Teacher Implementation

By the midyear review, at least 75% of teachers will demonstrate a common understanding of the difference between student compliance and cognitive engagement and will regularly implement active-engagement strategies identified through PLC collaboration. Teachers will provide evidence through PLC planning, lesson implementation, classroom walkthroughs, student work, and reflection on student feedback. PLCs will document the strategies implemented and instructional adjustments made based on evidence of student engagement.

End-of-Year Evidence of Teacher Implementation

By the end of the 2026–27 school year, at least 95% of teachers will consistently plan for and implement instructional strategies that promote authentic cognitive engagement, including student discussion, questioning, collaboration, problem-solving, analysis, and explanation of thinking. Teachers will use PLC collaboration, classroom walkthrough feedback, student feedback, and evidence of student learning to evaluate the effectiveness of engagement strategies and make documented adjustments to instruction.

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.

School leadership will monitor implementation through regular classroom walkthroughs using common indicators designed to distinguish student compliance from active cognitive engagement.

Walkthrough observations will examine whether students are:

- doing the majority of the thinking rather than primarily listening to the teacher;
- discussing academic content and explaining their reasoning;
- asking and responding to meaningful questions;
- collaborating purposefully with peers;
- solving problems and applying their learning;
- reading, writing, analyzing, creating, or producing evidence of their thinking;
- making choices or taking ownership within the learning process;
- demonstrating understanding rather than simply completing a task; and
- able to explain what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how they know whether they are successful.

PLC groups will regularly review classroom engagement practices and discuss the effectiveness of strategies being implemented. Teachers will share successful practices, examine student work and learning evidence, and collaboratively determine instructional adjustments.

School leadership will review walkthrough trends during monthly accountability meetings to identify schoolwide strengths and areas requiring additional support. Student surveys will also be administered periodically to gather student perceptions regarding engagement, classroom participation, academic challenge, student voice, and ownership of learning.

The purpose of monitoring will not be simply to determine whether an engagement strategy was observed, but to determine whether the strategy resulted in meaningful student thinking and learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration Team, PLC Facilitators, 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:

Professional Learning Communities Focused on Cognitive Engagement

Rationale:

PLCs will engage in a continuous cycle of collaborative inquiry focused on increasing active student engagement. Teachers will examine the difference between behavioral compliance and cognitive engagement, identify evidence-based instructional strategies, collaboratively plan opportunities for active learning, implement strategies, analyze student response, and refine instruction. Each PLC will regularly focus on the question: "Who is doing the thinking in this lesson—the teacher or the students?" PLC conversations will move beyond whether students were quiet, on task, or completing assignments and instead examine the quality of student thinking, discussion, problem-solving, questioning, collaboration, and ownership demonstrated during instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Active Learning and Student Discourse

Rationale:

Teachers will intentionally incorporate active-learning strategies that require all students to cognitively engage with lesson content. Strategies may include structured academic discussion, collaborative problem-solving, think-pair-share, student questioning, retrieval practice, written responses, peer explanation, text-based discussion, problem-based learning, and opportunities for students to explain and defend their reasoning. Strategies will be selected based on the instructional purpose rather than simply for participation. Teachers will emphasize instructional activities that require students to demonstrate thinking and understanding.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Establish a common understanding of compliance versus cognitive engagement.

Person Monitoring:

School Administration, PLC Facilitators

By When/Frequency:

September 30th, 2026

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

School leadership will introduce the Area of Focus and provide professional learning on the difference between students who are simply compliant/on-task and students who are actively thinking, discussing, questioning, problem-solving, and demonstrating ownership of learning. A common set of student-engagement indicators will be established for classroom walkthroughs and PLC discussions.

Action Step #2

Use PLCs to plan, implement, and evaluate active-engagement strategies.

Person Monitoring:

School Administration, PLC Facilitators

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

PLC groups will identify and implement specific instructional strategies designed to increase student thinking and participation. PLC discussions will include examination of student work, classroom experiences, assessment results, and teacher reflection to determine whether strategies are producing authentic cognitive engagement rather than simple task completion. Effective practices will be shared across PLC groups and instructional teams.

Action Step #3

Conduct classroom walkthroughs and use student feedback to monitor engagement.

Person Monitoring:

Administration Team

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

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

School leadership and instructional coaches will conduct regular walkthroughs using common engagement indicators. Walkthrough trends will be shared with PLCs and reviewed during monthly accountability meetings. Student surveys will also be used to determine whether students perceive increased opportunities for discussion, collaboration, decision-making, academic challenge, and ownership of their learning. Results will be used to identify additional professional learning and instructional support needs.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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

Dissemination Methods

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

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

The approved SIP and Schoolwide Plan will be made publicly available through the school's website. Stakeholders will also be informed of the plan and its priorities through multiple methods, including:

- faculty and staff meetings;
- Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings;
- School Advisory Council and/or stakeholder meetings;
- Title I Annual Parent Meeting and other family engagement events;
- Governing Board meetings;
- student meetings, leadership groups, and student feedback opportunities;
- parent and family emails and electronic communications;
- school newsletters and other school communication platforms; and
- partnerships and communication with local businesses and community organizations, as appropriate.
-

School leadership will review the major goals, Areas of Focus, evidence-based interventions, and measurable outcomes with staff so that all instructional and support personnel understand their roles in implementation.

Students will receive information about applicable school improvement priorities through student meetings, classroom discussions, student leadership opportunities, surveys, and other student voice activities. Particular attention will be given to helping students understand how schoolwide improvement efforts relate to academic achievement, student engagement, attendance, school climate, and their individual success.

Families will be provided opportunities to review and provide feedback regarding school improvement priorities during Title I and stakeholder meetings, surveys, family engagement activities, and other school events. Information will be presented in clear, family-friendly language rather than relying solely on technical educational terminology.

Information will be provided in a language and format families can understand (English, Spanish and Haitian Creole).

Progress toward SIP goals will be reviewed throughout the school year rather than only at the conclusion of the plan. School leadership will analyze implementation and outcome data during monthly accountability meetings, while teachers and instructional staff will review relevant academic and instructional data through PLC meetings.

Progress will be communicated to stakeholders through staff meetings, stakeholder/SAC meetings, Governing Board meetings, Title I/family engagement activities, surveys, electronic communication, and updates to the school community as appropriate.

Stakeholder feedback will be collected throughout the year from students, families, teachers, staff, and school leadership. Feedback, along with student achievement, learning gains, subgroup performance, classroom engagement data, and other schoolwide indicators, will be used to determine whether strategies are effective and whether revisions to the SIP or Schoolwide Plan are necessary.

The School Improvement Plan will be publicly available on the school's website:
www.southtechschools.org

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)).

The school will build and maintain positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders through consistent, proactive, and two-way communication that supports the school's mission and the academic, social, and emotional needs of students.

A primary goal will be to ensure that communication with families occurs regularly and is not limited to situations in which there is a problem. Teachers and school staff will be encouraged to communicate

positive student progress, accomplishments, improvements, and opportunities for support so that families view the school as a collaborative partner in their child's success.

The school will host quarterly parent and family engagement nights designed to provide families with relevant information and practical resources. Topics may include academic progress, graduation requirements, assessment information, college and career readiness, financial aid, attendance, student engagement, school programs, available interventions, and strategies families can use to support learning at home. Parent nights will also provide opportunities for families to ask questions, interact with staff, and provide input regarding school programs and priorities.

To ensure that family engagement efforts are responsive to actual needs, the school will administer frequent parent and family surveys throughout the year. Surveys will be used to identify:

- the information parents and families most want or need to receive;
- topics families would like addressed during parent nights or other school events;
- preferred methods of communication;
- barriers that may prevent families from participating in school activities;
- the most convenient times and formats for meetings or informational sessions; and
- suggestions for improving school-family communication and engagement.

Survey results will be reviewed by school leadership and used to adjust communication methods, family engagement activities, and the types of information provided to families.

Parents and families will be kept informed of their child's progress through multiple communication methods, including teacher communication, progress reports and report cards, conferences, electronic grade information, email, phone calls, school communication platforms, academic intervention meetings, and individualized outreach when a student requires additional support. When concerns arise, staff will communicate with families early so that the school and family can work collaboratively to identify solutions before concerns become more significant.

The school will also promote positive outreach, encouraging teachers and staff to contact families to recognize student success, improvement, effort, leadership, and other positive accomplishments.

This approach is intended to strengthen trust and ensure that communication between home and school is viewed as an ongoing partnership rather than primarily a response to academic or behavioral concerns.

Community stakeholders, local businesses, organizations, and community partners will be invited to support the school's mission through mentorship, career and college readiness opportunities, student activities, service projects, family events, resource sharing, and other partnerships that address identified student and family needs.

School leadership will regularly evaluate the effectiveness of family and community engagement efforts through participation data, survey results, stakeholder feedback, and discussions during leadership and accountability meetings. Feedback will be used to continuously improve how the school communicates with families, provides information, and creates meaningful opportunities for parents and community stakeholders to participate in the success of students and the school.

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)).

The school is committed to continuously strengthening its academic program with the goal of ensuring that all students experience rigorous, engaging, standards-aligned instruction and demonstrate academic growth. Each Area of Focus identified in Part II of the School Improvement Plan has been intentionally designed to strengthen the quality of instruction, increase meaningful learning time, address identified achievement gaps, and support the school's goal of outperforming both the district and state across academic measures.

The school's 2025–26 assessment results demonstrate areas of significant academic strength, including performance above district and state averages in multiple EOC-tested subjects. The school will build upon these successes while addressing areas in which student achievement, subgroup performance, and learning gains indicate opportunities for continued improvement.

Mathematics Learning Gains

The school's mathematics Area of Focus addresses the need to increase Mathematics Learning Gains, particularly among students within the Lowest 25%. Although students demonstrated strong overall achievement in Algebra and Geometry compared with district and state performance, the school identified student growth as an area requiring additional attention.

The academic program will be strengthened through common standards-aligned assessments, data-driven instructional planning, targeted small-group instruction, and Math Coach push-in and pull-out support. These additional instructional supports will increase the amount and quality of learning time for students who have not yet demonstrated mastery while allowing students who demonstrate proficiency to continue progressing toward more advanced mathematical skills.

Teachers and the Math Coach will use assessment results to quickly identify skill deficits, provide targeted reteaching and intervention, and reassess students to determine mastery. This continuous instructional cycle will maximize instructional time and ensure that intervention is responsive to individual student needs.

ELA Achievement and Learning Gains for Identified Subgroups

The school will strengthen its ELA program through evidence-based literacy instruction, targeted intervention, and individualized student monitoring, with particular attention to Students with Disabilities and the Multiracial subgroup identified within the SIP.

Instruction will include explicit and systematic literacy instruction, differentiated small-group support, structured academic discussion, comprehension strategy instruction, vocabulary development, and opportunities for students to read, analyze, discuss, and respond to increasingly complex grade-level text.

Achieve3000 will provide supplemental differentiated literacy practice and additional opportunities for

students to strengthen reading comprehension and vocabulary skills. Teachers will use student performance data to identify individual needs, adjust instructional groupings, and provide additional intervention when students are not demonstrating sufficient growth.

Because the Multiracial subgroup consisted of only 27 students during the 2025–26 school year and contributed to the school's ATSI identification, the school will closely monitor each student's instructional needs and ensure appropriate academic resources and interventions are provided.

Active Student Engagement and Cognitive Engagement

The Positive Learning Environment Area of Focus will also strengthen the academic program by addressing the distinction between student compliance and authentic engagement in learning. Although students generally demonstrate appropriate behavior, follow classroom expectations, and interact respectfully with staff, the school recognizes that a compliant student is not necessarily an actively engaged learner. The instructional focus will therefore emphasize increasing opportunities for students to think, question, discuss, analyze, collaborate, problem-solve, explain their reasoning, and take ownership of their learning.

PLCs will focus specifically on increasing cognitive engagement and examining the question, "Who is doing the thinking—the teacher or the students?" Teachers will collaboratively plan and evaluate instructional strategies designed to move classrooms from passive participation toward active learning.

This Area of Focus is directly connected to academic outcomes. The school has established a measurable goal of increasing ELA Learning Gains from 55% to at least 60% and Mathematics Learning Gains from 50% to at least 55% during the 2026–27 school year.

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 is not identified as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) or Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) school; therefore, coordination with CSI or TSI activities is not applicable. The school is identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) based on the performance of the Multiracial student subgroup. The needs of this subgroup have been incorporated directly into the SIP through a specific Area of Focus, evidence-based literacy interventions, individualized student monitoring, and targeted resource allocation.

The SIP will remain a living document throughout the school year. Student achievement data, stakeholder feedback, PLC discussions, monthly accountability reviews, and implementation data will be used to evaluate progress and revise strategies, interventions, and resource allocations when

necessary.

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)).

Preparing students for success after high school is central to the school's mission. The school is committed to ensuring that students graduate prepared not only to earn a high school diploma, but also to successfully transition into college, the workforce, and productive citizenship.

The school has consistently maintained a graduation rate and acceleration rate of 98% or higher, demonstrating that nearly all students leave high school having met graduation requirements while also earning an acceleration measure, such as an industry certification or other qualifying college and career readiness credential. This reflects the school's commitment to ensuring that students graduate with meaningful preparation and credentials that extend beyond the traditional high school diploma. Students are provided with ongoing opportunities to explore postsecondary education and career pathways throughout high school. College and career readiness efforts include academic advising, graduation planning, career exploration, industry certification opportunities, Career and Technical Education (CTE) coursework, exposure to postsecondary education options, and information regarding employment and workforce opportunities.

The school will continue to broaden students' access to rigorous and accelerated coursework that allows them to earn credentials and, when available and appropriate, postsecondary credit while still enrolled in high school. Students will be encouraged to pursue coursework and experiences aligned with their individual academic interests, career goals, and postsecondary plans.

Industry certification remains an important component of the school's college and career readiness program. These certifications provide students with opportunities to demonstrate career-specific knowledge and skills and leave high school with credentials that may support immediate employment, continued technical education, or further postsecondary study.

School counselors, teachers, administrators, and CTE staff will work collaboratively with students to ensure that graduation plans include appropriate academic coursework, acceleration opportunities, and preparation for each student's intended postsecondary pathway. Students will receive information regarding college admissions, technical and career education, workforce opportunities, financial aid and scholarships, and other resources that support successful transition beyond high school.

The school will also continue to develop relationships with local businesses, community organizations, postsecondary institutions, and workforce partners to provide students with increased exposure to career opportunities, industry expectations, and pathways available within the local community and beyond.

Progress will be monitored through graduation data, acceleration data, industry certification attainment, student course completion, postsecondary planning activities, and other college and career readiness indicators.

The school's goal is for every student to graduate with a clear postsecondary plan and with the academic preparation, skills, credentials, and experiences necessary to successfully enter college, the workforce, or another appropriate postsecondary pathway and to become a productive and engaged citizen.

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)).

N/A - No Pre-School Aged Children

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.

The school operates as its own Local Educational Agency (LEA); therefore, the school conducts both the school-level and LEA-level review of resources to ensure that available personnel, instructional programs, intervention supports, professional development, scheduling, and funding are aligned to identified student needs.

The school was identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) based on the performance of the Multiracial student subgroup. During the 2025–26 school year, the school served 27 Multiracial students. In response to this identification, improving ELA achievement and learning gains for Multiracial students has been included as a specific Area of Focus within the School Improvement Plan.

Because this subgroup is relatively small, the school will conduct a student-by-student review of the academic needs, instructional supports, intervention services, and available resources for Multiracial students. School leadership, instructional staff, and intervention personnel will review student achievement data, learning gains, classroom assessments, course performance, Achieve3000 data, student work, and intervention data to determine whether resources are appropriately addressing identified needs.

Resource utilization will be reviewed through monthly accountability meetings, PLC meetings, leadership team meetings, budget reviews, and other school-level data-review processes. The review will consider whether students have equitable access to qualified instructional staff, evidence-based literacy interventions, differentiated small-group instruction, instructional materials, supplemental academic support, professional learning, and sufficient intervention time.

School administration will also review staffing assignments, student schedules, intervention schedules, class placement, instructional materials, technology, and available federal, state, and local funds to determine whether resources are being used effectively to support the students and subgroups identified through the needs assessment.

If student performance data indicate that current resources or interventions are not resulting in sufficient academic progress, school leadership will adjust or reallocate resources as appropriate.

Adjustments may include increased intervention frequency, smaller instructional groups, additional instructional time, changes in staffing support, additional professional learning, changes in instructional strategies, or the purchase or implementation of additional instructional resources.

The effectiveness of resource allocation will be evaluated throughout the school year based on student progress and implementation data, with particular attention to whether the achievement and

learning-gain gaps for the Multiracial subgroup are decreasing.

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).

The school has identified specific instructional, personnel, intervention, and professional learning resources to address the academic needs of the Multiracial subgroup and the ELA achievement and learning-gain concerns that contributed to the school's ATSI identification.

During the 2025–26 school year, the school served 27 Multiracial students. Only 45% of Multiracial students demonstrated ELA proficiency, compared with 64% of All Students, and only 20% demonstrated an ELA learning gain, compared with 55% of All Students. These data demonstrate the need for targeted literacy intervention, individualized progress monitoring, and additional instructional support.

The following resources will be used during the 2026–27 school year:

Achieve3000 Literacy: Achieve3000 will be used as a supplemental literacy intervention to provide differentiated reading instruction and practice based on individual student needs. Teachers will use Achieve3000 assessment, Lexile, activity, and performance data to identify skill deficits and provide targeted support in reading comprehension, vocabulary, informational text, and written response. Achieve3000 data will be reviewed throughout the school year during PLC and monthly accountability meetings.

Targeted Small-Group Literacy Intervention: ELA, reading, and intervention staff will provide targeted small-group instruction based on specific standards and skill deficits identified through prior-year assessment data, classroom assessments, student work, course performance, and Achieve3000 data. Groups will remain flexible and will be adjusted throughout the year based on student response to intervention.

Explicit and Systematic Literacy Instruction: Teachers will implement evidence-based literacy practices including direct vocabulary instruction, teacher modeling, guided practice, comprehension strategy instruction, text-dependent questioning, written response, and opportunities for students to analyze and discuss complex grade-level text. These strategies will be incorporated into core instruction and targeted intervention throughout the school year.

Instructional and Intervention Personnel: ELA teachers, reading/intervention staff, instructional leadership, MTSS personnel, and school administration will work collaboratively to monitor the academic performance of Multiracial students and determine whether additional supports are needed. Because the subgroup consisted of only 27 students in 2025–26, the school will maintain an

individualized student-level monitoring process to ensure that each student's needs and response to intervention are regularly reviewed.

Professional Learning Communities: PLC time will be used throughout the school year to analyze student performance, identify standards requiring additional support, develop differentiated instructional strategies, review intervention effectiveness, and share evidence-based literacy practices. Teachers will use student performance data to adjust instruction and intervention rather than waiting until the end of the year to determine effectiveness.

Professional Development: Professional learning will focus on explicit literacy instruction, differentiation, student engagement, formative assessment, small-group instruction, and strategies for supporting students who are not demonstrating adequate achievement or growth.

Beginning of Year: Review prior-year data for Multiracial students; identify individual academic needs; establish intervention groups; review student schedules and available instructional supports; and determine initial resource allocation.

Throughout Each Quarter: Implement targeted literacy instruction and Achieve3000; administer and review classroom and common assessments; monitor course performance and student work; and adjust intervention groups and instructional strategies based on student response.

Monthly: Review Multiracial student performance during accountability meetings and PLCs. Determine whether resources, interventions, staffing supports, or instructional strategies need to be modified or intensified.

Midyear: Conduct a comprehensive review of student progress and resource effectiveness. Reallocate or increase resources when data demonstrate that students are not making sufficient progress.

End of Year: Evaluate ELA achievement and learning gains for the Multiracial subgroup and determine the effectiveness of the resources and interventions implemented during the school year. Findings will be used to inform the following year's School Improvement Plan and resource-allocation decisions.

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