

Alachua County Public Schools

RESILIENCE CHARTER SCHOOL INC



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 8
 - D. Early Warning Systems 9
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 12
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 13
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 14
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 15
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 16
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 19
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 20
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 43
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 46
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 58
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 61

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

To cultivate a dynamic learning community based on innovation, social justice, and environmental stewardship. The Resilience Charter School engages students through authentic relationships and project-based learning, empowering them to think critically, persevere with grit, design creative solutions, and act with mindfulness and compassion.

Provide the school's vision statement

Resiliency is an inherent human trait that empowers us with the capacity to overcome challenges, gain new insights, and build skills. Supportive relationships cultivate deep resilience, and this is why we emphasize building authentic relationships with our students. Inspired by the global mythology of the rising phoenix, we support one another in rising strong. Resilience Charter School creates a supportive yet challenging learning environment which inspires academic excellence and active citizenship, developing a hub of empowerment for Alachua County youth. Students apply their burgeoning knowledge and skills to pro-actively contribute to the enrichment of the world, thereby becoming lifelong learners. Resilience Charter School aims to propagate a model of excellence.

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

Michael Aponte

MAponte@ResilienceCharter.org

Position Title

Director/Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Director of Operations. Oversees school budget, staffing & HR, systems development & maintenance, technology, & coordination of administrator, teacher, & support staff roles & relationships.

Leadership Team Member #2**Employee's Name**

Geno Schmelke

Dean@ResilienceCharter.org

Position Title

BRT/Title 1 Teacher Lead

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Serve as a liaison between school leadership and instructional staff regarding Title I compliance and academic goals. Monitor implementation of Tier 1 & Tier 2 interventions using Title I-supported materials and personnel. Support data collection and analysis to evaluate impact of Title I-funded strategies on student performance

Assist with coordination of parent and family engagement events tied to literacy and academic growth. Maintain documentation of Title I-related professional development, tutoring, and support activities. Support student behavior intervention through restorative practices, behavior contracts, and check-in/check-out systems. Analyze discipline trend data to support positive behavior strategies and reduce instructional disruptions. Collaborate with teachers and admin on proactive behavior supports tied to academic performance. Serve as a member of the MTSS team, contributing behavioral data and intervention tracking.

Leadership Team Member #3**Employee's Name**

Lisa Blankenship

ESE@ResilienceCharter.org

Position Title

ESE Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Provide individualized and small group instruction for students with IEPs across academic settings. Monitor and document student progress on IEP goals in collaboration with general education teachers. Participate in MTSS and data review meetings to support early identification and support for struggling students. Ensure compliance with all state and federal IDEA requirements, including

annual reviews and reevaluations

Train and collaborate with staff on differentiated instruction and accommodations for students with disabilities. Serve as a liaison between families and the school regarding ESE services and student support.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Jazmin Calderon-Marquez

JCalderon@ResilienceCharter.org

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Facilitate weekly PLCs and professional learning aligned to B.E.S.T. Standards and school-wide instructional goals. Support classroom teachers through coaching cycles: co-planning, modeling lessons, and providing feedback. Analyze FAST, i-Ready, and classroom data to help teachers adapt instruction for all tiers. Collaborate with leadership on developing and delivering targeted professional development

Assist with progress monitoring implementation, intervention fidelity checks, and instructional walk feedback loops. Mentor new teachers and support schoolwide implementation of literacy and math improvement strategies.

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.

On **June 5th and July 8, 2025**, Resilience Charter School held a structured SIP planning session to gather input from a wide range of stakeholders, including the full **School Leadership Team**, instructional staff, families, and community partners. The process included participation from **Delia Hunt** (governing board member and family liaison), **Curtis Peterson** (Principal of Caring & Sharing Schools), and **Randy Starling** (NCF Principal and Resilience Board Chair).

The SIP development process was grounded in a collaborative review of student performance data,

including 2024–25 school grade outcomes, FAST and i-Ready trends, and subgroup performance gaps. This session was designed to identify actionable priorities and collaboratively refine **SMART goals** focused on academic achievement and instructional improvement.

Input was collected through **live discussion**, allowing for real-time planning and consensus-building.

Key topics raised by stakeholders included:

- Ensuring newly hired instructional staff have the content expertise and support needed for immediate impact
- Establishing and sustaining high-quality **PLC structures** and **data chat protocols**
- Designing a master schedule that reflects **student learning needs**, including built-in intervention courses
- Eliminating short Wednesdays to provide consistent instructional time and improve routines school-wide

This input directly shaped the SIP's goals, leading to changes in the master schedule (daily morning PLCs, intervention periods), a renewed focus on instructional coaching, and professional learning tied to standards-aligned planning and student subgroup performance.

To ensure compliance with stakeholder inclusion for secondary schools, Resilience surveyed students at the end of the 2024–25 school year. Student feedback highlighted interest in project-based learning, increased structure and consistency, and personalized academic support. These insights influenced both academic and culture-based strategies in this plan.

While Resilience does not operate a formal School Advisory Council, it fulfills all requirements of stakeholder engagement under **20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2)** through inclusive leadership planning and community partnerships. Ongoing engagement will continue through **quarterly family nights**, **student surveys**, and **ongoing PLC and MTSS feedback loops**.

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 Resilience Charter School Leadership Team will regularly monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure increased achievement of all students, particularly those with the greatest academic needs (SWD, ELL, L25%, and FRL subgroups), in alignment with **ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)**.

Monitoring Responsibilities

The **Leadership Team**—including the Executive Director (Michael Aponte), Title I Lead (Geno

Schmelke), ESE Coordinator (Lisa Blankenship), and Instructional Coach (Jazmin Calderon-Marquez)—is responsible for overseeing SIP implementation with fidelity:

- The **Executive Director** ensures all instructional, behavioral, and data-driven strategies are implemented and monitored with fidelity.
- Mr. Schmelke supports teachers with data entry and Title I instructional alignment.
- Ms. Blankenship and Mrs. Calderon provide coaching and training support to teachers on analyzing and responding to student performance data.

All data will be recorded in **schoolwide spreadsheets**, updated bi-weekly. A **standardized Leadership Data Meeting form** is used to guide weekly SIP check-ins and document:

- Progress toward SMART goals
- Action steps taken
- Next steps and barriers to be addressed

Completed forms are archived to maintain a record of continuous progress monitoring and improvement decisions.

Monitoring Frequency and Meeting Schedule

Monitoring occurs weekly, with the following consistent cadence built into the master schedule (8:30-9:05 AM)

Monday | Data & goal reflection from the previous week and reminder for goals for the week

Tuesday | Curriculum planning

Wednesday | Assessment/data review (based on Friday assessments)

Thursday | Evaluate weekly goals and adjust instruction/interventions

Friday | Classroom management/behavioral trends discussion

Additionally:

- **Monday PM (3:30–4:30)** – Weekly ***Instructional Empowerment*** PLC for pedagogy improvement
- **Friday (11:20–11:50)** – Data review in grade-level teams (Math/Science and ELA/ESE)
- **Friday PM (3:30–4:30)** – Reserved for extended planning or SIP adjustment needs

Data Reviewed

The following metrics will be reviewed to track the impact of SIP strategies:

- **FAST PM1–PM3**
- **i-Ready Diagnostic and Growth Monitoring**
- **Magma Math Data**
- **Attendance & Discipline (with subgroup disaggregation)**
- **Progress Monitoring Trackers**

- **Walkthrough Data (using Cognia ELEOT tools)**

Walkthrough and trend data will be reviewed during weekly chats and triangulated with academic data.

Teacher Input

Teacher input is embedded in PLCs and feedback loops. While Resilience is currently staffed with a new teaching team, teacher voice will formally shape adjustments starting in **Quarter 2**, once teachers have a deeper understanding of their students and systems. Ongoing communication and feedback will occur regularly through small-team collaboration and direct communication with the leadership team.

Family & Community Feedback

Feedback is collected through:

- **Quarterly family nights** with embedded surveys
- **Student focus groups**
- **Monthly stakeholder meetings** with board liaison Delia Hunt, Curtis Peterson (Caring & Sharing), and Randy Starling (Board Chair)

Response When SIP Goals Are Off-Track

If SIP goals are not on track, the leadership team initiates **coaching cycles**, adjusts professional development, and realigns resources. All plan modifications are reviewed and approved by the Executive Director.

Mid-Year SIP Review & Plan Revision

The **Mid-Year SIP Review** will take place **after FAST PM2**, and include student representatives, family focus groups, and community stakeholders. If indicators are off track, a revised action plan will be created and communicated with all stakeholders and the district. Revised SMART goals and action steps will be tracked using updated monitoring forms.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	MIDDLE/JR. HIGH 6-8
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	100.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL	YES
RAISE SCHOOL	
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	CSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)* BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)* HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)*
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: D 2023-24: D 2022-23: C 2021-22: C 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment							26	45	35	106
Absent 10% or more school days							4	5	4	13
One or more suspensions							4	15	6	25
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							4	7	3	14
Course failure in Math							3	5	5	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							8	12	14	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							6	14	12	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators							8	5	10	23

Current Year 2025-26

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

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

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days							5	3	4	12
One or more suspensions							5	6	4	15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							1	11	7	19
Course failure in Math								4	1	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment										0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment										0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators							4	6	4	14

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

The number of students retained:

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

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

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

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	40	57	58	38	53	53	44	49	49
Grade 3 ELA Achievement			27			21			
ELA Learning Gains	54	59	59	55	57	56			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50	50	52	52	46	50			
Math Achievement*	27	57	63	37	56	60	38	51	56
Math Learning Gains	43	59	62	45	62	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56	53	57	50	56	60			
Science Achievement	20	49	54	16	45	51	30	46	49
Social Studies Achievement*	39	68	73	38	60	70	59	58	68
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration	40	81	77	27	79	74	50	75	73
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	49	53		53	49		48		40

*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)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	41%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	369
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
41%	40%	44%	47%	34%		48%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	26%	Yes	3	1
Black/African American Students	37%	Yes	6	
Hispanic Students	50%	No		
White Students	50%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	40%	Yes	2	

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	40%		54%	50%	27%	43%	56%	20%	39%	40%			
Students With Disabilities	20%		21%		20%	43%							
Black/African American Students	25%		51%	60%	21%	41%	54%	12%	29%				
Hispanic Students	70%		60%		20%	50%							
White Students	60%		58%		40%	42%							
Economically Disadvantaged Students	36%		48%	53%	26%	43%	54%	21%	35%				

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	38%		55%	52%	37%	45%	50%	16%	38%	27%			
Students With Disabilities	28%		63%		25%	29%							
Black/African American Students	29%		56%	56%	24%	35%	59%	7%	7%				
White Students	45%		46%		59%	67%		30%	67%				
Economically Disadvantaged Students	32%		55%	50%	34%	45%	53%	13%	36%				

2022-23 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 2021-22	C&C ACCEL 2021-22	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	44%				38%			30%	59%	50%			
Students With Disabilities	25%				6%								
Black/African American Students	28%				36%			27%	33%				
Hispanic Students	70%				40%								
Multiracial Students	57%				50%								
White Students	59%				38%				92%				
Economically Disadvantaged Students	44%				38%			26%	60%	46%			

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

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

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

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	6	48%	55%	-7%	60%	-12%
ELA	7	36%	56%	-20%	57%	-21%
ELA	8	42%	54%	-12%	55%	-13%
Math	6	30%	49%	-19%	60%	-30%
Math	7	39%	60%	-21%	50%	-11%
Math	8	0%	27%	-27%	57%	-57%
Science	8	19%	47%	-28%	49%	-30%
Civics		39%	66%	-27%	71%	-32%
Algebra		40%	57%	-17%	54%	-14%

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?

In the 2024–25 school year, Resilience Charter School's most significant academic improvement was in **Math Learning Gains**, which reached **56%**, the highest performance among all components of the school's state accountability data.

This improvement was directly linked to the school's increased focus on **human-led intensive math intervention**, which was **required for all Level 1 students**. These students were placed in **separate, scheduled math intervention courses** in addition to their core instruction. The intervention blocks were delivered by the math teacher and monitored using **i-Ready diagnostics and growth checks**, allowing for targeted remediation of skill gaps.

Additionally, executive director implemented several schoolwide instructional improvements that positively impacted math growth:

- Teachers were required to provide **bell-to-bell instruction**, eliminating non-instructional downtime and ensuring consistent engagement
- All tested courses administered **Friday assessments**, allowing for weekly data collection and early identification of student misconceptions
- Intensive Math instruction was consistently monitored through **learning walks and informal observations**, with real-time feedback and follow-up support provided

These strategies created a more structured and responsive instructional environment that led to measurable growth in student learning, particularly for those in the lowest performance quartile.

Lowest Performance

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

The lowest academic performance at Resilience Charter School in 2024–25 was in **Science Achievement**, which reached only **20% proficiency** on the statewide Grade 8 Science Assessment.

Several contributing factors influenced this outcome:

- **Inconsistent instructional delivery:** The science teaching role experienced changes during the school year, which limited instructional continuity and long-term planning. Furthermore, this was the same teacher from the previous year with no experience, prior to Resilience, teaching in a K-12 school.
- **Lack of lab-based, hands-on learning experiences:** Students had limited exposure to applied science tasks (e.g., experiments, labs, simulations), which are foundational to both content retention and science literacy.
- **Low integration of test-aligned strategies:** Compared to other tested subjects, science instruction lacked systematic use of standards-aligned formative assessments and did not fully utilize tools like ClearSight or item-spec review.
- **Limited spiral review:** Science content was often taught in isolated units without built-in scaffolding for prior-grade concepts, which are essential on the cumulative Grade 8 state science exam.

This was not a one-time dip; Science Achievement was also low in prior years, indicating a **persistent trend**. This year's score (20%) reflects an urgent need to build both teacher capacity and student engagement in the content area. Resilience is prioritizing instructional consistency with new science teachers, resource alignment, and embedded assessment practices for science in the 2025–26 plan.

Greatest Decline

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

In 2024–25, the most significant decline at Resilience Charter School occurred in **Math Learning Gains for students in the Lowest 25%**, which dropped from **50% in 2023–24 to 20%** in 2024–25, a 30-point decline.

This sharp drop occurred despite an overall increase in Math Learning Gains (from 45% to 56%) and suggests that the school's intervention model did not adequately support the **students most in need**—those performing in the bottom quartile.

Contributing factors included:

- **Intervention limits:** In 2024–25, only **Level 1 students** were enrolled in dedicated math intervention courses, excluding Level 2 students who may have benefitted from the same support.
- **Staffing transitions:** Mid-year staff changes in math reduced instructional consistency and limited the effectiveness of long-term intervention planning.

- **Over-reliance on digital platforms:** While i-Ready and IXL were used for progress monitoring, the school relied heavily on independent student work without sufficient direct instruction for the lowest performers.
- **Behavioral and attendance issues:** Some of the L25% students also had chronic absenteeism or behavioral challenges, which disrupted their instructional time and response to interventions.

In response, the 2025–26 plan includes expanding math intervention courses to both **Level 1 and Level 2 students**, increasing direct instruction during advisory, and replacing IXL with more strategic intervention tools (e.g., Magma Math) for teacher-led support by certified and experience Math teachers.

Greatest Gap

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

The largest achievement gap between Resilience Charter School and state performance benchmarks in 2024–25 was in **Science Achievement**. Resilience scored **20%**, compared to the estimated state average of **49%**, resulting in a **29-point deficit**.

This substantial gap reflects both **local and systemic challenges**:

- **Cumulative content and conceptual gaps:** The 8th grade science test measures knowledge spanning multiple years. Many students enter middle school with **limited background in life, earth, and physical science**, making rapid remediation difficult without early intervention.
- **Inconsistent instructional staffing:** Resilience faced mid-year transitions in science teaching staff, affecting pacing, assessment preparation, and instructional alignment.
- **Low access to lab-based learning:** Hands-on experiences like labs, demos, and inquiry-based learning were limited due to schedule constraints and lack of dedicated science space, decreasing student engagement and retention.
- **Minimal test-focused scaffolding:** Unlike ELA and Math, Science instruction lacked consistent spiral review, vocabulary reinforcement, and exposure to standards-based item types.

This gap is consistent with prior years and signals a **long-term instructional need** in science. In response, Resilience is prioritizing:

- Increased time for science during the regular schedule
- Vertical alignment with math and reading (especially for vocabulary and data interpretation)
- Incorporation of low-cost labs, virtual simulations with Meta Quest 3s's, and hands-on projects

to boost comprehension and engagement

EWS Areas of Concern

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

1. Course Failures in ELA and Math

A substantial number of students in Grades 6–8 failed at least one core subject—particularly in **Math and ELA**—during the 2024–25 school year. Course failures are a leading indicator of future academic disengagement and are often associated with:

- Skill gaps that were not addressed during Tier 1 instruction
- Behavioral or motivational challenges that impact task completion and assignment submission
- Lack of coordinated intervention between content teachers and student support staff

The school is prioritizing **weekly data review of grades**, along with **quarterly academic support plans** for at-risk students to proactively reduce failures during the 2025–26 school year.

2. Students with Two or More Early Warning Indicators

EWS tracking revealed a notable number of students across all grade levels who met **two or more risk criteria**, including chronic absenteeism, Level 1 performance on FAST, course failure, and behavior incidents. These students are most likely to experience long-term academic challenges without targeted, multi-tiered supports.

To address this, Resilience Charter School will:

- Use biweekly leadership meetings to track EWS status updates
- Develop **early intervention plans** for students flagged with multiple indicators
- Monitor intervention fidelity through progress logs and family contact notes
- Prioritize these students in both academic and social-emotional supports

These areas of concern are embedded in the school's broader MTSS framework and are addressed directly in SIP action steps through increased data review, intervention alignment, and family engagement.

Highest Priorities

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

Based on a comprehensive review of academic performance, ESSA subgroup trends, and early warning indicators, Resilience Charter School has identified the following five highest-priority areas for school improvement:

1. Improve Math Achievement, Especially for Students in the Lowest 25%

- 2024–25 Math Achievement was **27%**, and Math L25 Learning Gains declined from 50% to **20%**
- Priority Actions: Expand intervention to **Level 1 & 2 students**, implement **Magma Math**, restructure math PLCs to focus on task alignment, and increase direct instruction within

intervention blocks

2. Close the Science Achievement Gap

- Science Achievement was **20%**, representing a **29-point gap** compared to the state average
- Priority Actions: Stabilize science staffing, implement hands-on and lab-based learning, and embed science vocabulary strategies into Tier 1 and Tier 2 reading intervention supports

3. Increase Proficiency for Students With Disabilities (SWDs)

- SWDs scored **26% on the Federal Percent of Points Index**, below 41% for 3 years and below 32% in 2024–25
- Priority Actions: Align accommodations to instruction, increase push-in support, use disaggregated data to monitor IEP alignment, and prioritize coaching for teachers with SWD-heavy rosters

4. Reduce Course Failures and Strengthen Tier 1 Instruction

- High number of course failures flagged in EWS; especially in ELA and Math
- Priority Actions: Weekly grade checks, feedback protocols, end-of-week reteach planning, and embedded PD through **Instructional Empowerment** PLCs and walkthrough reflection

5. Monitor & Support Students with 2+ EWS Indicators

- A significant group of students meet **multiple early warning indicators** including absenteeism, Level 1 scores, and behavior
- Priority Actions: Leadership-led EWS tracker, early intervention plans, family contact logs, and use of student support teams (admin, BRT, ESE, and intervention leads)

These priorities were selected based on **realistic growth targets**, **limited staffing capacity**, and a **strategic focus on equity and subgroup progress**. They are fully integrated into the SIP's instructional strategies, professional learning plan, and monitoring systems.

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Resilience Charter School has identified **Math Achievement** as the core instructional area of focus for the 2025–26 school year. In 2024–25, only **27%** of students scored proficient in math (Level 3+), a **drop from 38%** in the prior year. Additionally, **Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% of students fell from 50% to 20%**, the largest single-year decline across all components.

This data suggests that while overall math instruction may have improved for some students (Learning Gains = 56%), Tier 1 and Tier 2 practices did not meet the needs of students with the most significant skill gaps. As a result, the SIP will prioritize improving **Tier 1 instruction** through standards-aligned planning and pacing, while expanding **Tier 2 interventions** to include both Level 1 and Level 2 students.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2025–26 school year:

- **Math Achievement** (students scoring Level 3 or higher) will increase from **27% to at least 38%**
- **Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%** will increase from **20% to at least 40%**

Monitoring

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

Progress will be monitored through:

- **i-Ready diagnostic and growth monitoring** (3x/year)
- **Biweekly formative assessments and exit tickets**
- **Weekly PLC data reviews** using Friday assessment results

- **Walkthrough data** using COGNIA's ELEOT tool to monitor task alignment and small group instruction
- **MTSS tracking** for Tier 2 students receiving math intervention

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Geno Schmelke

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:

i-Ready Florida Math Instruction and Magma Math

Rationale:

Adaptive diagnostic + instruction platform aligned to B.E.S.T. standards; used for data and remediation

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Description of Intervention #2:

Resilience Charter School implements small-group instruction in math as a Tier 1 core instructional strategy for Grades 6–8. All students receive whole-group instruction followed by small-group rotations based on weekly formative assessment data, i-Ready diagnostics, and classroom observations. Instructional groups are fluid and change weekly to ensure differentiation, enrichment, and reteach opportunities for all learners — not just those identified for intervention.

Rationale:

2024–25 Math Achievement was 27%, with only 56% of L25% students making learning gains. Leadership walkthroughs and FAST data showed students needed targeted support within daily instruction — not just in separate intervention blocks. Small group instruction increases engagement, targets misconceptions, and allows immediate reteaching aligned to B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Formative Assessment Feedback Cycles

Rationale:

Weekly assessment + reteach model aligned to PLCs and real-time growth feedback

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Expand math intervention to include Level 2 students

Person Monitoring:

Executive Director, Math Team

By When/Frequency:

August 2025 onward

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

In 2024–25, only Level 1 students received intensive math intervention. For 2025–26, all Level 1 and Level 2 students will be enrolled in a daily math support block in addition to their core instruction. These courses will be led by certified staff and use progress monitoring tools to track growth.

Action Step #2

Implement daily bell-to-bell math instruction expectations

Person Monitoring:

Executive Director, Math Team

By When/Frequency:

August 2025 onward

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

All math teachers will be trained and held accountable for delivering full-period instruction with active engagement strategies and daily objectives posted. Breaks and non-instructional time will be minimized.

Action Step #3

Launch weekly PLC data reviews and reteach planning

Person Monitoring:

Instructional Coach (Mrs. Calderon), Math Lead

By When/Frequency:

August 2025 onward

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

Weekly math PLCs will be used to analyze Friday assessments, review student work, and collaboratively plan reteach strategies for students who did not meet the standard. PLCs will be facilitated using a schoolwide data reflection form aligned to the B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

Action Step #4

Conduct monthly walkthroughs with feedback (using ELEOT)

Person Monitoring:

Admin Team

By When/Frequency:

Monthly (Sept–May)

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

The leadership team will use COGNIA's ELEOT tool to conduct monthly walkthroughs and provide feedback to ensure instructional alignment, task complexity, and student engagement. Teachers will receive targeted support if walkthrough trends show instructional gaps.

Action Step #5

Use i-Ready diagnostic and growth checks to inform groupings

Person Monitoring:

Math Teachers, ESE (Ms. Blankenship)

By When/Frequency:

Sept, Dec, March 2026

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

i-Ready diagnostic and growth monitoring data will be used to group students, measure progress, and track instructional impact. Reports will be reviewed at midpoints and compared to subgroup performance trends.

Area of Focus #2

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

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

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

In 2024–25, only **20%** of Resilience Charter School students scored proficient on the statewide Grade 8 Science Assessment. This score represents the school's **lowest overall proficiency** and reflects a **29-point gap** compared to the estimated Florida state average (~49%).

This performance indicates an urgent need to strengthen science instruction by increasing engagement, implementing hands-on learning experiences, and ensuring alignment with tested content across life, earth, and physical sciences. Prior walkthroughs and teacher reflections confirmed gaps in lesson continuity, lab access, and test-aligned vocabulary exposure.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2025–26 school year, the percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or above) on the Grade 8 Science Assessment will increase from **20% to at least 35%**.

Monitoring

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

- **Quarterly common science assessments** aligned to Florida Science 8th grade standards
- **Student data tracking forms** for scientific vocabulary and content mastery
- **Exit tickets and content checks** built into each unit
- **Walkthroughs** using the ELEOT tool to observe engagement, content rigor, and lab integration
- **Teacher reflection and action planning** in Friday team PLCs (Science/Math)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Description of Intervention #1:

Hands-On Learning (Labs, Demos, Simulations)

Rationale:

Research-supported increase in content retention and science literacy when students experience inquiry-based learning

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Description of Intervention #2:

Project-Based Learning Tasks

Rationale:

Builds engagement and deeper understanding; aligns with Resilience's existing showcase model

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Science Vocabulary Integration

Rationale:

Embedded vocabulary instruction and spiral review supports comprehension and test readiness

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Implement weekly science lab activities or virtual simulations

Person Monitoring:

Science Teacher, Admin Team

By When/Frequency:

August 2025 onward

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

Teachers will integrate low-cost, hands-on lab experiences and virtual simulations that align with tested benchmarks. Materials will be gathered in advance and tied directly to state standards. Leadership walkthroughs will include a monthly check for lab implementation. PLCs will review student lab reflections and post-lab quizzes to evaluate concept mastery.

Action Step #2

Align unit planning to tested science benchmarks using district pacing

Person Monitoring:

Science Teacher, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

August 2025 onward

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

Teachers will revise science unit plans to ensure alignment with 8th grade Florida benchmarks. Pacing guides and assessment maps will be developed and reviewed in PLCs. Instructional Coach and Executive Director will review plans quarterly for standards alignment. Lesson plans and assessments will be collected and compared to state test item specifications.

Action Step #3

Integrate science vocabulary walls, flashcards, and review routines

Person Monitoring:

Science Teacher, Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

September 2025

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

Classrooms will implement science-specific word walls and embed vocabulary practice into bellringers, formative assessments, and reviews. These terms will mirror those from the state test specifications. Coaches and admin will monitor use of vocabulary tools during walkthroughs. Science quizzes will include targeted vocabulary questions. Word growth will be tracked with student self-assessments.

Action Step #4

Conduct formal monthly walkthroughs focused on engagement and scientific reasoning

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

Monthly, Sept–May

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

Admin and instructional support will conduct ELEOT-based walkthroughs to observe science task complexity, student engagement, and evidence of reasoning. Walkthroughs will result in documented feedback and coaching steps if needed. Walkthrough data will be compiled monthly, shared in leadership meetings, and cross-checked against student achievement data to determine alignment of instruction with student growth.

Action Step #5

Track science standard mastery via formative assessments

Person Monitoring:

Executive Director and Science teacher

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Teachers will administer checkpoint assessments aligned to state standards at the end of each unit. Data will be entered into a shared tracker and discussed during Friday science team PLCs. Leadership will review tracker data during weekly data meetings. Students not mastering content will

be identified for small-group re-teaching. month-over-month growth will be monitored.

Action Step #6

Host science-focused family night/project showcase

Person Monitoring:

Admin & Teachers

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

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

Teachers and students will design a spring showcase event with projects tied to science content. This will allow students to present their learning and connect content to real-world concepts in front of families. Family feedback surveys will be collected, and participation will be tracked. The event will also serve as a student self-assessment checkpoint for science vocabulary and comprehension.

Area of Focus #3

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.

In 2024–25, Resilience Charter School's **Students with Disabilities (SWD)** subgroup scored a **Federal Percent of Points Index of 26%**, remaining **below 41% for three consecutive years** and **below 32% in the most recent year**.

This performance places SWDs in a federally recognized at-risk category and highlights an urgent need for instructional, structural, and support-based changes. Although interventions and accommodations were provided, walkthrough data, PLC feedback, and student performance indicate inconsistent implementation and monitoring of IEP-aligned instruction, scaffolds, and progress tracking.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2025–26 school year:

- The **Federal Percent of Points Index for SWD** will increase from **26% to at least 40%**
- At least **40% of SWD students** will demonstrate proficiency or learning gains in **ELA or Math**, as measured by FAST and schoolwide data

Monitoring

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

the desired outcome.

- Monthly disaggregation of FAST, i-Ready, and assessment data by SWD subgroup
- Biweekly checks on IEP progress goals and service logs
- MTSS tracking of Tier 2 and 3 interventions, with emphasis on fidelity for SWDs
- Weekly PLC conversations include at least one SWD-specific instructional support conversation or planning review
- Walkthrough focus on accommodation use and differentiation in Tier 1

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Executive Director

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:

Edmentum Courseware

Rationale:

Standards-aligned platform with embedded accommodations and supports for SWD (audio, pacing, visuals)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Small Group Explicit Instruction

Rationale:

Teacher-led scaffolded instruction aligned to IEP goals and academic gaps

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

UDL-Aligned Accommodations & Tools

Rationale:

Use of sentence frames, graphic organizers, vocabulary walls, and visual aids to support comprehension

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Track SWD Progress with Edmentum & i-Ready Data

Person Monitoring:

Lisa Blankenship (ESE Teacher) & Jazmin
Calderon-Marquez (Instructional Coach)

By When/Frequency:

Biweekly, ongoing from August 2025 through May
2026

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

Teachers and support staff will use biweekly Edmentum and i-Ready reports to identify student progress and gaps among students with disabilities in both ELA and Math. The data will be used to adjust small-group instruction, target IEP goals, and identify students in need of Tier 2 adjustments. Progress will be logged and reviewed in PLCs and during monthly leadership data reviews. Monitoring tools include shared tracking sheets, intervention logs, and subgroup growth reports pulled at midpoints for analysis.

Action Step #2

Host Monthly PLCs Focused on SWD Differentiation

Person Monitoring:

Jazmin Calderon-Marquez (Instructional Coach),
Geno Schmelke (Title I Lead)

By When/Frequency:

Monthly, beginning September 2025

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

Resilience will facilitate monthly PLC sessions focused on differentiation and scaffolding strategies for students with disabilities in core content areas. Sessions will include data reflection, lesson modeling, and teacher collaboration on IEP-aligned supports. Attendance and reflection forms will be collected, and implementation will be monitored through walkthroughs, lesson plan audits, and student performance comparisons between general and SWD populations.

Action Step #3

Monitor Accommodations & Instructional Fidelity

Person Monitoring:

Admin Team

By When/Frequency:

Monthly walkthroughs + quarterly IEP audit

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

Administrators will conduct monthly walkthroughs with a specific lens on SWD accommodations, small group instruction, and classroom implementation of IEP strategies. Fidelity checks will include review of teacher documentation, lesson plans, and real-time classroom observations. Additionally, quarterly IEP progress monitoring logs will be audited to ensure that accommodations are being delivered consistently and reflected in student data. Adjustments will be made through coaching and direct support based on trends.

Area of Focus #4

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction

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.

During the 2024–25 school year, Resilience Charter School flagged a **notable number of students with course failures in English Language Arts and Mathematics**, as reported in the Early Warning System (EWS) data. These failures are often linked to Tier 1 instructional gaps, lack of reteaching opportunities, inconsistent feedback loops, and student disengagement.

Internal review indicated that some students failed courses due to:

- Incomplete assignments
- Low test performance without intervention
- Behavioral or attendance issues
- Lack of pacing support or scaffolding in instruction

Reducing course failures is essential to improving student retention, self-efficacy, and subgroup achievement rates. It also directly impacts students with disabilities, ED students, and those identified with multiple EWS indicators.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2025–26 school year:

- The number of students with a **course failure in ELA or Math** will be reduced by at least **30%** compared to 2024–25
- **All students identified at risk for failure** will have a documented intervention plan by **mid-semester**

Monitoring

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

- Weekly gradebook reviews by content area teams
- Friday assessment cycles with performance reflections in PLC
- Monthly reporting of failure rates to administration and MTSS team
- Use of progress monitoring folders to track Tier 1 & Tier 2 support actions
- Quarterly parent communication logs for students at risk of failure

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Executive Director

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:

Friday Formative Assessment Cycles

Rationale:

Weekly checks for understanding with immediate reteach and regrouping by standard

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Targeted Re-teaching in Advisory

Rationale:

Embedded remediation block for missed skills based on grade trends

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Progress Monitoring & Feedback Loop

Rationale:

Weekly data review, student conferencing, and follow-up assignment planning via PLCs

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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

Weekly Gradebook Reviews & Student Follow-Up

Person Monitoring:

Geno Schmelke (Title I Lead), Lisa Blankenship
(ESE Teacher)

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, beginning August 2025

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

step:

Each Friday, teachers will review their gradebooks for students with failing averages or missing assignments. Identified students will be flagged, and staff will enter action steps into a shared intervention log. Students flagged two or more times will be referred to the MTSS team. The Instructional Coach and Title I Lead will review intervention logs biweekly to ensure support plans are in place and students are not “falling through the cracks.”

Action Step #2

Friday Formative Assessments + Reteach Planning in PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Jazmin Calderon-Marquez (Instructional Coach),
Michael Aponte (Executive Director)

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, starting August 2025

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

All tested ELA and Math courses will continue implementing Friday assessments to check mastery of weekly content. During Monday and Wednesday PLCs, teachers will review assessment trends and collaboratively plan reteach lessons for any standards where students scored below 70%. PLC notes will be logged weekly. Admin and the Instructional Coach will monitor student performance the following week for improvement.

Action Step #3

Parent Contact & Academic Recovery Plans for At-Risk Students

Person Monitoring:

Michael Aponte (Executive Director), Geno
Schmelke (Title I Lead)

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly progress checks + mid-quarter
monitoring

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

Students at risk of failing a course (defined as 60% or lower by mid-quarter) will be assigned an Academic Recovery Plan. Teachers or support staff will contact families and document the conversation. Students will be expected to attend targeted advisory sessions or complete missed mastery tasks. Recovery plan success will be monitored at quarterly grading checkpoints by admin, with adjustments made in collaboration with the MTSS team.

Area of Focus #5

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

Resilience Charter School’s 2024–25 EWS tracking revealed a substantial number of students exhibiting **two or more risk factors**, such as:

- Chronic absenteeism (missing 10%+ of instructional days)
- Course failure in ELA or Math

- Level 1 scores on statewide assessments
- One or more behavior referrals or suspensions

These students are at the **highest risk for long-term academic failure, disengagement, and grade retention**, especially when not identified early and supported with coordinated academic and behavioral interventions.

This trend was most concentrated in **grades 6 and 7**, and many students flagged also fell into high-need subgroups (SWD, FRL, or Black/African American). The EWS data showed that without early, structured action, students with 2+ indicators rarely self-correct without a plan.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2025–26 school year:

- The number of students with **two or more EWS indicators** will be reduced by **30%** from the baseline established in 2024–25
- **100%** of students with two or more EWS indicators will have an active intervention plan by the end of Quarter 1

Monitoring

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

- Students flagged with 2+ indicators will be entered into a **Leadership EWS Tracker**, reviewed biweekly
- Each student will be assigned to an intervention team lead (BRT, ESE, or MTSS)
- Intervention plans will be created and updated quarterly
- Behavior, attendance, and grade data will be disaggregated monthly for trend analysis and next steps
- MTSS and admin teams will review outcomes at each grading checkpoint

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Geno Schmelke

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:

Check-In / Check-Out (CICO) & Mentorship**Rationale:**

Daily relationship-building, goal-setting, and accountability led by trusted adults

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Tiered Attendance & Behavior Interventions

Rationale:

Data-driven interventions based on attendance and behavior patterns with family and teacher collaboration.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Description of Intervention #3:

Wraparound MTSS Case Management

Rationale:

Individual plans addressing academic, behavioral, and attendance needs; progress reviewed every 3–4 weeks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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

Individual plans addressing academic, behavioral, and attendance needs; progress reviewed every 3–4 weeks

Person Monitoring:

Geno Schmelke (Title I Lead / BRT)

By When/Frequency:

Beginning of Quarter 1 and updated biweekly

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

Using attendance, discipline, and academic data from the 2024–25 school year and ongoing checkpoints, students with two or more EWS indicators will be entered into a shared Leadership EWS Tracker. Each student will be assigned to a designated intervention team lead (ESE, BRT, or instructional support). This tracker will be reviewed biweekly during leadership meetings, and adjustments will be made based on current risk status and student progress.

Action Step #2

Implement Individualized Student Intervention Plans

Person Monitoring:

Lisa Blankenship (ESE), Michael Aponte
(Executive Director)

By When/Frequency:

Plans created by end of Quarter 1; reviewed
quarterly

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

Each student with multiple indicators will have a personalized intervention plan that may include academic recovery sessions, Check-In/Check-Out (CICO) protocols, parent meetings, and behavior or attendance contracts. Plans will be created by the assigned lead and reviewed quarterly to determine effectiveness. Progress will be documented in student folders and reviewed by the MTSS team, who will make data-driven recommendations for intensification or adjustments.

Action Step #3

Monitor Attendance, Behavior & Grades Monthly with Leadership Team

Person Monitoring:

Admin Team

By When/Frequency:

Monthly, during administrative data review
meetings

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

Leadership will monitor monthly disaggregated data reports across three domains: attendance, discipline, and course performance. Students with two or more indicators will be prioritized in walkthroughs, interventions, and communications with families. If improvement is not observed over a six-week period, the student's support plan will be adjusted, and the case will be escalated to the MTSS or behavior team.

Area of Focus #6

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**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.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale (Grades 6–8):

Resilience Charter School has identified **student attendance and engagement** as a priority focus area across all middle school grade levels (Grades 6–8). This area of focus is designed to address both **chronic absenteeism** and the underlying school culture conditions that influence student motivation, behavior, and sense of belonging.

In 2024–25, Early Warning System (EWS) data indicated that **over 10% of students were chronically absent**, defined as attending fewer than 90% of school days. Students with poor attendance frequently overlapped with those demonstrating low academic performance, behavior referrals, or multiple EWS indicators. These patterns disproportionately affected subgroups including **SWD, ED, and Black/African American students**, according to the school's ESSA Federal Index review.

Chronic absenteeism was also identified as a **barrier to instructional effectiveness** in weekly leadership meetings, where lesson walkthrough data showed that absent students were missing foundational instruction in core subjects, often returning disengaged or overwhelmed.

The school recognizes that improving academic outcomes is not possible without **first building a schoolwide culture of safety, consistency, and connection**. Therefore, this Area of Focus prioritizes Tier 1 attendance and engagement systems, schoolwide SEL routines, and positive behavioral support structures.

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 the 2024–25 school year, **more than 10% of Resilience Charter School students** (Grades 6–8) were identified as **chronically absent**, meaning they attended **less than 90% of school days**.

These students were significantly more likely to also show risk indicators such as course failures and Level 1 FAST performance.

Measurable Outcome for 2025–26:

- By May 2026, Resilience will reduce the number of students with chronic absenteeism (**<90% attendance**) by **at least 30%** compared to the 2024–25 baseline.
- Additionally, **100% of students who reach the 90% threshold at any point during the year** will receive documented family outreach and be placed on a personalized attendance plan within **5 school days** of identification.
- **Quarterly school climate surveys** will show an increase of at least **15 percentage points** in students reporting:
“I feel safe and connected at school.”

These goals apply to **all students in Grades 6–8**, with progress tracked monthly and disaggregated by subgroup.

Monitoring

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through a combination of **weekly attendance reviews**, **monthly engagement data**, and **leadership team progress checks** to ensure implementation fidelity and impact on student connection and attendance.

Monitoring for Implementation

- **Weekly Attendance Tracker Reviews**

The Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT) and administrative team will review attendance logs each Monday to flag students approaching or falling below 90% attendance. These students will be added to the internal EWS Tracker and monitored for intervention follow-up.

- **Advisory & SEL Walkthroughs**

Admin and instructional coaches will conduct monthly walkthroughs of morning advisory sessions to ensure that SEL lessons and check-ins are being implemented consistently across all grade levels (6–8).

- **CICO & Family Communication Logs**

Documentation will be collected for all students enrolled in Check-In/Check-Out or family attendance meetings, ensuring that Tier 2 supports are being deployed with fidelity.

Monitoring for Impact

- **Monthly Data Reports**

The Leadership Team will analyze monthly attendance trends disaggregated by grade level and subgroup (SWD, ED, Black/African American, L25%). These will be used to measure progress toward the goal of reducing chronic absenteeism by 30%.

- **Quarterly Climate Surveys & Focus Groups**

Student climate surveys will be administered quarterly to measure changes in student perceptions of safety, connection, and engagement. Trends will inform adjustments to SEL routines and advisory programming.

- **Progress Review at Mid-Year SIP Meeting**

In January 2026, the school will conduct a mid-year SIP data review to determine if attendance and climate goals are on track. If not, the team will adjust intervention strategies and re-engage students and families using new incentives or restructured supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Michael Aponte, Director

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:

Resilience Charter School is implementing a Tier 1, schoolwide intervention model that combines daily SEL routines embedded in advisory with a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) framework. These strategies are applied universally across all grade levels (Grades 6–8) and are designed to improve student connectedness, reduce chronic absenteeism, and create a positive learning environment where every student feels safe, supported, and engaged. SEL lessons are aligned to CASEL's five core competencies and include structured routines such as check-ins, goal-setting, emotional regulation strategies, and relationship-building activities. PBIS implementation includes schoolwide behavior expectations, consistent reinforcement systems, and staff modeling.

Rationale:

In 2024–25, EWS data showed that more than 10% of students were chronically absent, and students with 2+ risk indicators commonly reported low connection to school. These factors directly limited academic progress, particularly for SWD and ED students. The school's needs assessment revealed that engagement and safety must be strengthened through consistent routines, predictable

structures, and trusted adult relationships. Tier 1 SEL and PBIS strategies were selected because they address whole-school culture and universal skill-building, which are foundational to student success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

Implement SEL Routines in Morning Advisory

Person Monitoring:

Jazmin Calderon

By When/Frequency:

Beginning August 2025; monitored weekly

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

All students in Grades 6–8 will participate in structured Tier 1 SEL routines during advisory (8:30–9:00 AM daily). These include check-ins, goal setting, emotional regulation practices, and class discussions aligned to CASEL competencies. The instructional coach will provide teachers with SEL prompts and monitor fidelity through monthly walkthroughs and PLC check-ins. Student climate surveys will be used to assess impact.

Action Step #2

Launch PBIS Schoolwide Recognition System

Person Monitoring:

Geno Schmelke

By When/Frequency:

August 2025 launch; incentives awarded monthly

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

Staff will explicitly teach and reinforce schoolwide behavior expectations (Respect, Responsibility, Resilience). Students demonstrating these behaviors will earn monthly recognition through class raffles, shoutouts, and PBIS points. The BRT will oversee the collection of PBIS data, track participation across classrooms, and present progress in monthly leadership meetings. This intervention is universal (Tier 1) and meant to proactively improve behavior and attendance.

Action Step #3

Administer and Analyze Quarterly Climate Surveys

Person Monitoring:

Michael Aponte, Director

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly (Oct, Jan, Mar, May)

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

To monitor the impact of SEL and PBIS on student connection and engagement, the school will conduct quarterly climate surveys with all students. These surveys will include items aligned to safety, belonging, and trusted adult relationships. Results will be disaggregated by grade and subgroup, shared during leadership meetings, and used to refine advisory content or behavior supports. Focus groups will supplement the data collection process.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Positive Learning Environment – Student Attendance & Engagement

Based on 2024–25 Early Warning System (EWS) data, **more than 10%** of Resilience Charter School students had attendance below 90%, qualifying them as **chronically absent**. Chronic absenteeism was particularly concentrated in students with additional risk factors—such as failing grades, behavioral referrals, and Level 1 proficiency in ELA or Math.

At Resilience, inconsistent attendance directly impacts academic performance, student-teacher relationships, and Tier 1 instructional access. Building a **positive learning environment** where students feel safe, supported, and engaged is a key driver of academic and behavioral success—and is especially important for our SWD and L25% populations.

In response, the school will address **attendance, engagement, and school culture cohesively**, embedding behavioral interventions, incentive systems, and student voice into day-to-day operations.

Measurable Outcome

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

By the end of the 2025–26 school year:

- Chronic absenteeism (students attending <90% of school days) will decrease by **30%** from the 2024–25 baseline
- **At least 80% of students** will report feeling safe, supported, and connected at school (as measured by school climate surveys)

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.

- Monthly attendance reports disaggregated by subgroup
- Weekly flagging of students approaching the 90% threshold
- Quarterly student climate and engagement surveys

- Student focus groups led by staff or community partners
- Leadership team review of behavior and attendance trends at each grading period

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Executive Director

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:

Check-In / Check-Out (CICO) Using "Hallpass" by Raptor and Advisory Teachers

Rationale:

Daily mentorship and relationship-building for at-risk students; focuses on attendance and goal-setting

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Description of Intervention #2:

Tiered Attendance Intervention

Rationale:

Combines family outreach, student contracts, and community partner involvement

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Positive Behavior Supports (PBIS)

Rationale:

Schoolwide expectations, incentives, and SEL routines embedded in Tier 1

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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

Weekly Attendance Monitoring and Outreach

Person Monitoring:

Geno Schmelke (BRT / Title I Lead)

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, beginning August 2025

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

Every Monday morning, the Leadership Team will receive a report of students whose attendance has dropped below 90%. Students at risk of chronic absenteeism will be flagged and monitored weekly. Designated staff will contact families to discuss barriers and co-develop action plans. Trends will be reviewed during leadership meetings to determine if interventions are working. Students who continue to miss school will be referred to the MTSS or behavior team for additional supports.

Action Step #2

Implement Attendance Incentives and Recognition Systems

Person Monitoring:

Aponte (Executive Director), Admin Team

By When/Frequency:

Monthly recognition, with ongoing implementation

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

Resilience will launch a monthly attendance incentive program, including individual and homeroom recognition for improved and perfect attendance. Rewards may include public recognition, dress-down passes, classroom celebrations, or raffle entries. The impact will be monitored through attendance logs and trend comparisons each month. Incentive effectiveness will be evaluated via survey feedback and attendance shifts in targeted student groups.

Action Step #3

Facilitate Quarterly Student Climate Surveys and Focus Groups

Person Monitoring:

Jazmin Calderon-Marquez (Instructional Coach),
Curtis Peterson and Delia Hunt (Community Partner)

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly (Fall, Winter, Spring, EOY)

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

Resilience will administer quarterly student climate surveys to assess safety, belonging, and support. In addition, selected students will participate in focus groups facilitated by school staff or community partners like Caring & Sharing. Feedback will be reviewed by the Leadership Team and used to shape schoolwide SEL strategies, adjust student recognition systems, and elevate student voice. Results will be tracked longitudinally to identify trends in school climate improvement.

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.

Resilience Charter School is committed to transparency and accessibility in sharing the School Improvement Plan (SIP), Schoolwide Program (SWP), and, where applicable, the UniSIG budget with all stakeholders, including students, families, staff, governing board members, and community partners. The school will use the following dissemination methods:

1. Stakeholder Communication Channels

- **School Website:** The SIP, SWP, and budget summaries will be posted on the school's website in an easily accessible location. The page will include both **PDF versions and simplified summaries** for families.
- **Parent Newsletters:** A summary of the SIP and progress updates will be shared through **quarterly newsletters** (print and digital), sent via Remind, email, and available at the front office.
- **Translated Documents:** Key documents and summary pages will be translated into **Spanish**, and additional translations will be provided upon request to ensure accessibility for non-English-speaking families.

2. In-Person & Virtual Events

- **Title I Annual Meeting:** At the beginning of the school year, the SIP and SWP priorities will be presented to families during the **Title I Annual Meeting**, with time for Q&A and feedback.
- **Quarterly Family Nights:** Each event will include a **progress update** on academic goals and a recap of Title I and SIP action steps tied to student learning.
- **Student-Led Conferences & Showcases:** Teachers will embed SIP-aligned learning goals and progress tracking into student showcases, creating family connections to the school's

improvement strategies.

3. Internal Staff & Leadership Dissemination

- **Weekly PLCs:** Teachers and support staff will review and reflect on SIP goals as part of their weekly data cycles, with ongoing updates from the instructional coach and leadership team.
- **Monthly Leadership Meetings:** The SIP will be used as a **living guide** during leadership team meetings and MTSS data reviews. Progress will be documented, and implementation adjustments will be communicated clearly to all staff.

4. Community & Board Engagement

- **Governing Board Presentations:** The SIP and UniSIG budget will be reviewed with the board in public meetings at the beginning of the school year and again at mid-year.
- **Community Partners (e.g., Caring & Sharing, NCF):** Stakeholder summaries will be shared with local partners involved in school mentoring and support. Community input will be gathered through informal focus groups or interviews.
- **Public Posting Requirement:** The school will meet all statutory posting requirements by publishing the SIP on the school's website and maintaining a hard copy at the front office.
- School Grade and SWP: <https://www.resiliencecharter.org/about/our-school/>
- SIP, Budget including UNISIG: <https://www.resiliencecharter.org/about/board-of-directors/>

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)).

Resilience Charter School is committed to building strong, trust-based relationships with parents, families, and community partners in order to fulfill its mission of empowering students through academic, emotional, and real-world readiness.

To achieve this, the school uses a multifaceted approach that ensures regular communication, access to student data, partnership in academic planning, and authentic engagement opportunities.

1. Consistent Two-Way Communication

- Teachers use platforms like **Google Classroom, and email** to keep parents informed of assignments, grades, and behavior trends.
- **Progress reports and academic recovery updates** are shared every 4.5 weeks.
- Bilingual communication is offered in English and Spanish, and translation support is available for additional languages upon request.

2. Shared Ownership of Student Growth

- Families of students with academic or behavioral risk indicators participate in **intervention plan meetings** and receive updates via calls, texts, or in-person conferences.
- **Student-led conferences** and **project-based showcases** allow students to present their work directly to families and articulate their own progress.

3. Family Engagement Events

- Resilience hosts **quarterly family nights** that combine student exhibitions with access to schoolwide data and classroom strategies. These events provide a platform for family feedback and help demystify instructional approaches.
- Title I updates, attendance incentives, and behavioral supports are also shared during these nights.

4. Community Partnership Integration

- Community organizations such as **Caring & Sharing**, **North Central Florida CARES**, and others are invited to participate in school events, student mentorship, and resource sharing.
- Community leaders such as **Curtis Peterson** and **Randy Starling** serve as ongoing advisors and connectors between families and wraparound supports.

5. Family Voice in Planning

- Resilience uses **family surveys**, **student focus groups**, and **one-on-one conversations** to gather feedback that informs SIP goals, programming decisions, and culture shifts.
- Parents also serve on informal advisory roles and are invited to provide testimonials and feedback used for marketing and mission-sharing.

This commitment to transparent communication, community integration, and shared accountability ensures that parents and families are not just informed, but genuinely **engaged as partners** in student success.

- Parental Family Engagement Plan
 - <https://www.resiliencecharter.org/community/parent-student-resources/>

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)).

Resilience Charter School is implementing a multi-tiered academic improvement strategy to strengthen the core program, increase instructional time, and expand opportunities for enriched and accelerated learning for all students. This plan is closely tied to **Areas of Focus identified in Part II of the SIP**, including Math Achievement, Science Instruction, and SWD proficiency.

1. Increase the Quality and Quantity of Instructional Time

- **Daily Morning PLCs and Friday Data Meetings:** Teachers meet each morning (8:30–9:00 AM) to plan, reflect on student progress, and revise instruction. This ensures better use of core instructional time.
- **Friday Formative Assessment Cycles:** Weekly assessments in tested subjects provide timely data for reteach planning, helping prevent gaps before they widen.
- **Embedded Intervention Courses:** Students scoring Level 1 and 2 on FAST receive **additional math and reading intervention blocks** built into the master schedule, increasing learning time without removing core instruction.
- **Academic Recovery Plans:** Students with course failures are enrolled in recovery and support sessions during advisory or elective time.

2. Enriched and Accelerated Curriculum Opportunities

- **Project-Based Learning and Showcases:** Quarterly showcases allow students to demonstrate mastery through real-world, cross-curricular projects aligned with B.E.S.T. Standards. These projects are especially emphasized in science, social studies, and elective areas.
- **Acceleration in Civics and Digital Tools:** High-performing students are placed in **Civics** and **career and technology courses** that allow them to earn middle school acceleration points and certifications.
- **Cross-Content Literacy Integration:** Teachers in all subjects incorporate reading, writing, and academic vocabulary strategies to support deeper comprehension and critical thinking.

3. Strategic Use of Resources for Subgroup Support (SWD, L25%)

- **i-Ready and Edmentum:** Students receive personalized instruction aligned to diagnostic assessments and B.E.S.T. benchmarks.
- **Push-In Support for SWD:** Instructional assistants and ESE-certified staff provide in-class accommodations and coaching, increasing access to rigorous content.
- **Small Group, Scaffolded Instruction:** All teachers are trained in data-driven grouping and differentiated lesson delivery, with regular coaching cycles to improve implementation.

Linked Areas of Focus from Part II of the SIP

This section directly supports the following SIP Areas of Focus:

- **Math Achievement (Area 1):** Expanded intervention time and weekly formative assessments
- **Science Achievement (Area 2):** Enrichment through project-based tasks and standards-aligned labs
- **SWD Proficiency (Area 3):** Increased access through accommodations, instructional scaffolds, and small-group models
- **Course Failures (Area 4):** Academic recovery time and student-specific support plans

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 Improvement Plan (SIP) for Resilience Charter School was developed in full alignment with federal, state, and local services and programs to support the **academic achievement, health, and social-emotional development** of all students.

The plan reflects coordination across the following areas:

1. Title I and MTSS Framework

This SIP doubles as the Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) plan and is built on a **comprehensive needs assessment** of student academic and behavioral data. Through the MTSS framework, Title I funding is used to support:

- Intervention teachers and instructional materials
- Progress monitoring systems (i-Ready, Edmentum)
- Family engagement events aligned to SIP priorities
- Professional learning targeting Tier 1 & Tier 2 instructional quality

2. Collaboration with Community-Based Supports

Resilience works with local and regional partners to address broader student and family needs. Key collaborations include:

- **Caring & Sharing Charter Network** (Curtis Peterson): Leadership coaching, student mentorship, and staff wellness practices
- **North Central Florida CARES (Randy Starling)**: Academic enrichment and SEL support services
- **University of Florida & Local Nonprofits**: After-school enrichment and attendance interventions

These partnerships strengthen implementation of strategies outlined in Areas of Focus related to chronic absenteeism, SWD supports, and student engagement.

3. Coordination with State & Local Programs

The school's plan integrates:

- **Career & Technical Education (CTE)**: Students have access to digital media, business, and technology courses aligned to Florida's workforce pathways. This supports middle school acceleration and contributes to the long-term vision of high-demand career readiness.
- **District-Provided Services**: The SIP aligns with Alachua County's district-wide guidance on school improvement, behavior intervention, and data reporting.
- **Safety & Behavior Supports**: Resilience aligns schoolwide expectations and behavior response practices with the **Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)** model

and recent legislative updates under HB 443 and HB 1255.

4. Student Wellness and Wraparound Services

Though Resilience does not currently offer in-house nutrition or housing programs, the school maintains referral pathways to local services through:

- **Family liaison partnerships** (Delia Hunt)
- **City/county resource connections** for housing insecurity and food assistance
- Access to **mental health and social work services** via contracted providers for students in crisis

5. Plan Alignment with TSI/ESSA Accountability

As outlined in the ESSA Federal Index analysis, the SIP addresses **underperforming subgroups**, particularly Students with Disabilities and Black/African American students. The plan includes SMART goals, progress monitoring, and coaching aligned with **Targeted Support & Improvement (TSI)** protocols.

This multi-tiered coordination ensures the SIP is not just a compliance document, but a **comprehensive strategy** that leverages every available resource—federal, state, and local—to support the whole child and drive sustainable school improvement.

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)).

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Resilience Charter School recognizes that student success depends not only on academic achievement, but also on the development of social-emotional, behavioral, and life skills. In alignment with the SIP's whole-child approach, the school provides layered support systems designed to improve students' skills **outside the core academic content areas**, including counseling, behavior support, SEL strategies, and mentoring.

1. Counseling and School-Based Mental Health Services

- Resilience contracts with **certified mental health professionals** to provide **on-site counseling** and crisis support when needed.
- Students may be referred for counseling through self-referral, teacher recommendation, or MTSS meetings.
- The school collaborates with local agencies for students needing **Tier 3 services**, including wraparound care.

2. Behavioral Support and Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)

- The school implements a **Positive Behavior Support (PBS)** model to reinforce positive behavior, respect, and responsibility.
- A full-time **Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT)** works with students exhibiting behavioral challenges and supports skill-building through check-ins, restorative conversations, and behavior contracts.
- SEL routines and topics are embedded into **morning advisory blocks**, with staff modeling emotional regulation, goal setting, and interpersonal skills.
- Staff are trained in **trauma-informed practices** (e.g., TBRI) and behavior de-escalation.

3. Mentorship and Student Leadership Opportunities

- Students can participate in **Check-In / Check-Out (CICO)** with trusted adults, reinforcing daily engagement and accountability.
- Partnerships with leaders like **Curtis Peterson** and **Delia Hunt** support student motivation through guest talks, mentoring, and leadership development.

- Student voice is elevated through **focus groups, surveys, and feedback loops** that empower students to shape school culture.

4. Life Skills, Career Exposure, and Enrichment

- Through the school's **Career & Technical Education (CTE)** initiative, students gain early exposure to digital media, entrepreneurship, and project-based problem solving.
- Quarterly **family showcases** allow students to present their work to the community and practice communication, planning, and reflection skills.
- Students participate in **community engagement projects** that connect learning to real-world challenges, increasing agency and civic awareness.

Together, these strategies ensure students are supported not just as learners, but as **growing individuals with emotional, social, and future-ready competencies**. These supports are integrated into the school's SIP, Title I plan, and MTSS framework to ensure alignment and accessibility for all learners.

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)).

Resilience Charter School is committed to preparing all students for long-term success by embedding **college and career readiness** into its academic program and culture, beginning in middle school. The school's approach includes early exposure to **career and technical education (CTE)** pathways, digital tools, entrepreneurial thinking, and soft skills that support success beyond K–12 education.

1. Career and Technical Education (CTE) Pathways

- In 2025–26, Resilience will offer exploratory CTE programs in **Digital Media, Entrepreneurship, and IT Fundamentals**, aligned to **Florida's Career and Professional Education (CAPE)** framework.
- Students will engage with **industry-recognized tools and platforms** such as Adobe Creative Suite, Google Workspace, and introductory coding and design tools.
- The CTE curriculum includes project-based learning, certification-aligned skill building, and exposure to **real-world job roles** in design, business, health, and technology.

2. Workforce Readiness Skills

- All students participate in **quarterly project showcases** where they present their work publicly, developing skills in **communication, time management, and self-advocacy**.
- Teachers integrate **critical thinking, collaboration, and technology fluency** into daily lessons, helping students apply academic content to real-world problems.

- Advisory and SEL time includes mini-lessons on **goal-setting, responsibility, and planning**, building foundational habits of success.

3. Awareness of Postsecondary Options

- Resilience holds **college and career exploration events** that include virtual college tours, career guest speakers, and skill workshops in resume writing and public speaking.
- Students receive guidance on Florida's **career pathways** and are introduced to **early credit opportunities** that may be available through articulation agreements as the school expands.
- Staff highlight opportunities such as **Dual Enrollment, Bright Futures**, and **Florida College System tracks** to help students build early awareness of future academic options.

4. Community Partnerships and Mentorship

- Local professionals and board members (e.g., **Randy Starling, Curtis Peterson**) support student learning through mentoring, guest speaking, and program design support.
- The school is exploring partnerships for students to engage with **local businesses and organizations**, offering insight into regional workforce trends and internships as Resilience builds toward high school expansion.

Through these strategies, Resilience Charter School ensures that students are not only meeting academic expectations but are also developing the skills, mindset, and exposure necessary to pursue **college, technical careers, or entrepreneurial paths** with confidence.

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)).

Resilience Charter School implements a **schoolwide multi-tiered system of support (MTSS)** to proactively address student behavior, provide early intervention, and coordinate services for students with and without disabilities. This framework ensures that **problem behavior is addressed consistently and equitably**, and that services are aligned with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) where applicable.

1. Tiered Behavior Support Framework

Resilience uses a **three-tiered behavior model** grounded in **Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)** principles:

- **Tier 1 – Universal Supports**
 - Schoolwide expectations (Respect, Responsibility, Resilience) are explicitly taught, posted, and modeled across all classrooms and common areas.
 - Students are recognized for positive behavior through verbal praise, class incentives, and schoolwide raffles.

- Teachers use **restorative language**, de-escalation strategies, and behavior reflection tools before removing students from class.
- **Tier 2 – Targeted Supports**
 - Students who display repeated behavior concerns are referred to the **Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT)** or MTSS team.
 - Interventions may include **Check-In/Check-Out (CICO)**, **social-emotional skill groups**, behavior contracts, and small-group restorative circles.
 - Attendance and behavior data are monitored weekly to identify patterns and assign supports.
- **Tier 3 – Intensive, Individualized Supports**
 - Students with ongoing or severe behavior challenges receive **Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs)** and **Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs)**, coordinated with the ESE team.
 - When appropriate, services are provided under IDEA, and progress is monitored with documented IEP goals.

2. Coordination with IDEA Services

- Behavior supports for students with disabilities are delivered in alignment with IEPs. The ESE Coordinator ensures that accommodations and behavioral goals are implemented and progress monitored.
- BRT and ESE staff collaborate to ensure behavioral data informs IEP development and reevaluation meetings.

3. Data Monitoring and Decision Making

- A shared **Behavior and Intervention Log** tracks office referrals, Tier 2 placements, and intervention responses.
- Behavior data is reviewed **weekly in leadership meetings** and **monthly in MTSS/PLC cross-team check-ins**.
- Patterns are used to adjust Tier 1 instruction (e.g., reteaching expectations), reinforce Tier 2 systems, and identify students in need of Tier 3 support.

4. Family and Community Engagement

- Parents are involved in early intervention planning, behavior meetings, and receive communication logs tied to student progress.
- Community partners, including **Curtis Peterson** and local mentors, assist in supporting students with Tier 2/3 needs through coaching, conversations, and SEL integration.

This tiered, integrated system ensures that students receive proactive, timely, and inclusive supports for behavior — protecting instructional time, preventing exclusionary discipline practices, and upholding IDEA compliance.

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)).

Resilience Charter School offers a robust professional learning program that is strategically designed to improve instructional practice, increase effective use of assessment data, and support the recruitment and retention of high-quality educators—particularly in high-need areas such as mathematics, science, and special education.

1. Instructional Improvement Through Ongoing Professional Learning

Professional development is embedded into the school's weekly and monthly schedule through the following:

- **Daily Morning PLCs (8:30–9:00 AM):** Staff meet in grade-level and content-aligned teams to reflect on data, review lesson alignment, and prepare interventions based on formative assessments.
- **Monday Instructional Empowerment PLCs (3:30–4:30 PM):** Focused on pedagogy, classroom management, engagement strategies, and differentiation, especially for SWDs and L25% students.
- **Monthly PD Workshops:** Covering key topics such as:
 - Small-group instruction and progress monitoring
 - ESE accommodations and IEP implementation
 - Science instructional alignment to Florida standards
 - Behavior de-escalation and restorative practices
 - Culturally responsive teaching and student engagement strategies

All sessions are **data-informed**, tied to SIP priorities, and led by the instructional coach, executive director, and external partners where applicable.

2. Use of Data to Drive Instruction

Teachers and staff are trained and supported in analyzing and applying data from:

- **i-Ready, Edmentum, and progress monitoring trackers**
- **FAST PM1–PM3 results**
- Weekly **Friday formative assessments** in ELA, Math, and Science
- **Walkthrough feedback** using Cognia's ELEOT framework

Data is used to inform small-group instruction, reteach planning, SWD progress monitoring, and behavior interventions. Staff document action steps weekly, which are reviewed by the leadership team to ensure follow-through and support.

3. Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers

To attract and retain high-quality educators, Resilience Charter School provides:

- **A supportive and collaborative school culture**, focused on teacher voice and leadership
- **Ongoing coaching cycles** and instructional support from administration and peers

- **Mentoring for new teachers**, with support in lesson planning, classroom management, and relationship-building
- Opportunities to lead projects, present PD, or pilot new instructional tools
- Recognition and positive reinforcement for professional growth

In 2025–26, Resilience is prioritizing **recruitment in science, special education, and math**, with flexible scheduling, targeted coaching, and planning time built into the school day to support teacher success and reduce burnout.

Through this structured, purposeful professional learning system, Resilience ensures all staff—teachers, and support personnel—are equipped to meet student needs, grow in their roles, and remain part of a mission-driven team.

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

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

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

Process to Review the Use of Resources

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

Resilience Charter School engages in an annual and ongoing collaborative process with the **Alachua County School District** to review the use of federal, state, and local resources in alignment with the school's identified student needs and SIP priorities. This process ensures that all expenditures are **needs-based, data-driven, and strategically aligned** to improve student outcomes.

1. Needs Identification and Budget Planning

- Each spring, the leadership team conducts a **comprehensive needs assessment** using current-year data (school grades, EWS, subgroup performance, MTSS trends).
- Based on identified gaps, the team drafts a **resource allocation plan** that supports Areas of Focus such as Math Achievement, Science Instruction, SWD support, and Chronic Absenteeism.
- This plan is reviewed alongside the **Title I, UniSIG, and general budget allocations** provided by the district.

2. Collaboration with District Program Specialists

- Resilience leadership meets with **district Title I, ESE, and Finance program specialists** to review spending guidelines, allowable costs, and compliance documentation.
- When required, school-level budgets are adjusted in collaboration with the **Grants and Federal Programs Office** to ensure alignment with allowable uses and SIP action steps.

3. Internal Monitoring and Adjustment

- The Executive Director, in partnership with the Finance Clerk and Governing Board, conducts **monthly budget reviews** to ensure that actual expenditures align with SIP priorities.
- Budget tracking tools and purchasing logs are maintained for all programs, including Title I, ESSER, and any local grants.
- If data trends shift midyear (e.g., increase in SWD referrals or behavioral needs), resources may be reallocated—such as hiring additional support staff or purchasing intervention tools.

4. Stakeholder Transparency and Feedback

- Budget priorities are shared at **Title I family events**, Governing Board meetings, and stakeholder sessions.
- Input is gathered from **parents, teachers, and community partners** on how resources are being used and whether they are having the desired impact.

- Feedback is documented and used during **mid-year SIP reviews** to refine resource strategies.

5. Alignment with Federal Guidelines

- The school ensures full compliance with **ESSA, IDEA, and Florida DOE regulations** by referencing allowable use documents and consulting the district as needed.
- Budgetary decisions are aligned to address the **whole child**, supporting both academic and non-academic needs like SEL, behavior, and family engagement.

This transparent, collaborative, and data-informed process ensures that resources are **maximized to drive equity, academic improvement, and whole-child development**, while maintaining full compliance with state and federal guidelines.

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).

Resilience Charter School has aligned its 2025–26 resource allocations to directly address the academic and engagement needs identified through the 2024–25 school grade data, Early Warning System indicators, and subgroup performance (ESSA Federal Index). Resources are being deployed to address the following priority areas:

1. Math Achievement & Intervention Expansion

- **Resources:**
 - Intervention teacher(s) supported by **Title I funds**
 - **i-Ready Florida Math** and **Edmentum courseware** licenses
 - Classroom supplies for small-group math instruction
- **Rationale:**
 - Math proficiency dropped from 38% to 27%, even though Math L25 Gains at 56%
 - Intervention time is being expanded to include both Level 1 and Level 2 students
- **Timeline:**
 - Resources will be active from **August 2025 through May 2026**
 - Student progress will be reviewed **biweekly** and at quarterly checkpoints

2. SWD Proficiency and Inclusive Practices

- **Resources:**
 - ESE-certified staffing supported through general funds and **IDEA coordination**
 - Progress monitoring software (i-Ready)
 - PD time for accommodation training and IEP-aligned instruction
- **Rationale:**
 - SWD subgroup Federal Index = **26%** (below 32%) for the third year
 - Walkthroughs showed inconsistent use of accommodations and scaffolding
- **Timeline:**
 - Instructional supports begin **August 2025**; progress reviewed **quarterly**

3. Science Achievement & Engagement

- **Resources:**
 - Materials for **monthly labs** and simulations
 - Supplies and incentives for **quarterly science showcase events**
 - Instructional coaching time focused on standards alignment
- **Rationale:**
 - Science proficiency was **20%**, representing a 29-point gap from the state average
 - Students lacked access to hands-on, inquiry-based instruction
- **Timeline:**
 - Labs begin in **September 2025**; family events held quarterly

4. Chronic Absenteeism & Behavior Supports

- **Resources:**
 - **Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT)** funded through Title I
 - Attendance incentive materials and student contracts
 - Time set aside for student focus groups and family communication
- **Rationale:**
 - More than 10% of students were chronically absent in 2024–25
 - Behavior and absenteeism were common among students with 2+ EWS indicators
- **Timeline:**
 - Attendance reviewed **weekly**; incentives awarded **monthly**

5. Family Engagement and Academic Recovery

- **Resources:**
 - Title I budget allocated for **quarterly family nights**
 - Academic Recovery Plans coordinated by teachers and leadership
 - Translation and bilingual communication materials
- **Rationale:**
 - Family voice was key in stakeholder feedback and is essential to sustaining improvement
 - Students with academic failure flags need parent-involved planning and progress monitoring
- **Timeline:**
 - Family nights occur quarterly; recovery plans tracked by **mid-quarter checkpoints**

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.	No
--	----

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