

School Comprehensive Education Plan 2026–27

District	School Name	Grades Served
Schoharie Central School District	Schoharie Jr/Sr High School	6–12

Collaboratively Developed By:

The Schoharie Jr/Sr High School SCEP Development Team:
Matthew Wright, Director of Curriculum and PPS
David Russell, Jr./Sr. High School Principal
Sharon Swain, BOCES Liaison
Adriene Bush, Teacher
Kelly Fagnani, School Psychologist
Brittany Heintz, Teacher – Special Education
Carey Raymond, Teacher – Special Education
Katherine Skaar, Teacher
Rylie Smith, Teacher
Gabrielle Warren, School Counselor
Michele Sherer, Parent
Curt Dutcher, Parent

In partnership with the staff, students, and families of Schoharie Jr/Sr High School.

Part 1: Connecting Our Shared Understanding for Teaching and Learning

Purpose: Ground the plan to the District's shared understanding of what high-quality Tier 1 instruction looks like.

<p>High-Quality, Tier 1 Instruction:</p> <p><i>What is the District's definition for what we expect high-quality, equitable and adaptive Tier 1 instruction to look and feel like in every classroom?</i></p>	<p>Schoharie CSD defines high-quality Tier 1 instruction as a standards-aligned instructional core where student agency meets cognitive demand. It is equitable because every student—regardless of subgroup—will have access to the "Vital Few" high-leverage practices (Explicit Modeling, Systematic Checks for Understanding, and timely feedback). It is adaptive because teachers will utilize real-time data within Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to adjust scaffolds and interventions through a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) in alignment with the district's Strategic Plan.</p>
--	--

Part 2: Key Strategies/Instructional Priorities and Structures for Teacher Learning

Key Strategies/Instructional Priorities

KEY STRATEGIES / INSTRUCTIONAL PRIORITIES

Key Strategy 1: Explicit Modeling and Systematic Checks for Understanding (including Executive Functioning and Organizational Skills)
 Grounded in the district's "Vital Few" high-leverage practices, this priority focuses on ensuring all teachers consistently use explicit modeling during instruction and employ systematic checks for understanding (e.g., exit tickets, targeted questioning, mini-whiteboards) to identify gaps and adjust in real time. Survey data indicate that while 63% of students feel challenged to think deeply (Student Q.1), only 31% perceive consistent challenge across classes (Student Q.2), and only 23% of teachers report that professional learning is reinforced through coaching and collaborative time (Teacher Q.4). Addressing this priority will create a visible, shared instructional language district-wide. Middle school faculty voice (April 2026) strongly reinforces this priority: staff identified "more explicit instruction around organizational and executive functioning skills" as a top group-supported need, noting that students are arriving unprepared and lacking foundational academic habits. Faculty also called for a "pivot back to more traditional, direct instructional approaches" and cited the need for curriculum mapping with differentiation supports built in. This strategy directly answers those concerns by anchoring explicit modeling as a schoolwide, non-negotiable practice visible in every classroom.

Key Strategy 2: Building Purposeful Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with Curriculum Mapping and Vertical Alignment
 Teacher survey data reveal that only 28% of teachers feel team meetings stay focused on improving teaching and learning (Teacher Q.9), and only 31% believe professional learning connects to ongoing instructional priorities (Teacher Q.3). This priority focuses on transforming existing collaborative time into structured, instructionally focused PLCs where teams use student data to plan, adjust, and reflect—aligned directly to district DCIP Action 1 (Building District Capacity for PLCs). Middle school faculty voice (April 2026) makes this priority even more urgent: staff explicitly named "PLCs, grade-level and middle school-level collaboration, planning, and vertical alignment" as a top group-supported priority. They also identified curriculum mapping with differentiation supports, new teacher support around curriculum, and the need for time to develop and reflect around curriculum implementation as critical unmet needs. Faculty noted that nearly every instructor works in isolation ("a curricular island"), making it impossible to do meaningful cross-classroom comparisons on student content performance. This strategy directly builds the collaborative infrastructure that addresses those gaps.

Teacher Learning Core Structures

What structures and routines will support this in 2026-27?	Description	New / Refine
Teacher Collaborative Time (REQUIRED)	Structured PLC cycles anchored in the "Vital Few" instructional practices. Teams	REFINE

<p>When and how often: Bi-weekly, 45-minute structured PLC meetings embedded during the school day (e.g., during common planning, SCD, or designated department time). Monthly full-faculty learning sessions on superintendent conference days.</p> <p>What does this entail: Teams follow a structured protocol rotating among four PLC lenses: (1) reviewing student evidence aligned to the lesson's learning target, (2) analyzing assessment data to identify which students need targeted support, (3) co-planning next instructional moves using Explicit Modeling techniques, and (4) reflecting on the previous cycle's impact. Meetings are facilitated by a designated team leader or, when available, an instructional coach. Agendas and notes are documented in a shared Google Drive folder accessible to building leadership. The DCIP Action 1 Phase 1 foundation work will provide shared vocabulary and protocols beginning Fall 2026.</p>	<p>will use student work, exit ticket data, and common formative assessment results to drive planning. The MTSS team provides data reports to PLCs on student progress at key intervals (BOY, MOY, EOY). District DCIP support includes a shared strategy repository on Google Drive (by June 2027), the "Look For" tool developed by January 2027, and Intervention Compass training sessions (3x per year). Collaborative time is protected from non-instructional tasks to ensure fidelity.</p>	
<p>Opportunities for Teachers to Learn with Experts (CSI-B Required)</p> <p>When and how often: Monthly coaching cycles (observation + debrief) for all teachers. Peer observation opportunities quarterly, supported by substitute coverage coordinated by district. Intervention Compass data training 3x per year (BOY, MOY, EOY).</p> <p>What does this entail: As the district transitions toward a coaching model (DCIP Action 2), the Jr/Sr High School will work</p>	<p>The school will leverage the BOCES Liaison as the primary instructional expert while the district's coaching infrastructure is built. Support cycles include: (a) pre-observation conference to identify a look-for, (b) classroom observation using the "Vital Few" lens, and (c) a 20-minute debrief connecting evidence to the Key Strategy. For teachers new to explicit modeling, the BOCES Liaison will demonstrate model lessons. Peer observation release time will be coordinated through the district's substitute pool. All coaching and observation data are logged and shared with building leadership.</p>	<p>NEW</p>

<p>with a stakeholder-developed "Look For" tool (expected January 2027) to standardize observation language. In the near term, the BOCES Liaison and Director of Curriculum serve as expert resources, co-planning lessons, modeling explicit instruction techniques, and facilitating structured debriefs. Teachers rotate through peer observation cycles within departments, using a consistent observation protocol focused on the two Key Strategies. External professional development options aligned to Tier 1/II best practices will be piloted by June 2027 (DCIP Action 2).</p>		
--	--	--

Implementation

Preparing for a Successful Launch

BEFORE THE 1st DAY OF SCHOOL: What needs to happen before school starts to prepare our staff for understanding the Teacher Learning Core Structures and the Key Strategies to be pursued this year?	When?
Share the SCEP with all staff during opening-day faculty meeting; explain the two Key Strategies and why they were selected based on survey data and April 2026 faculty meeting input	September 2026 (Day 1)
Distribute the shared PLC meeting protocol and agenda template; establish bi-weekly PLC calendar for the year	August 2026
Introduce the "Vital Few" practices (Explicit Modeling, Checks for Understanding, Timely Feedback) through a 90-minute SCD session with concrete examples and non-examples across content areas; connect to faculty-identified need for explicit organizational/executive functioning instruction	August 2026 SCD
Launch curriculum mapping process: department teams begin mapping current courses to standards using a shared template; flag gaps, overlaps, and differentiation needs (responding to faculty request for "curriculum mapping with differentiation supports built in")	August 2026 / Fall 2026
Establish a consistent middle school grading policy for 2026-27 (responding to faculty-identified need); present draft to faculty for input before school starts	August 2026
Confirm BOCES Liaison schedule for monthly coaching cycles; share with all teachers	August 2026

Assign PLC team leads and share facilitation resources from district Google Drive; orient team leads to the PLC protocol	August 2026
Conduct BOY staff needs assessment survey to baseline PLC comfort and familiarity (aligned to DCIP Action 1 data collection)	September 2026

Key Strategy 1: Explicit Modeling and Systematic Checks for Understanding

FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR (September 2026 – January 2027)	
PLCs analyze BOY common assessment and universal screening data to identify which students are not yet accessing grade-level content; use data to plan explicit modeling lesson segments	October 2026
BOCES Liaison models explicit instruction lesson components in 2–3 classrooms per month; teachers observe and debrief using "Look For" tool once available (January 2027)	Oct–Jan
Department PLC teams co-design and peer-review at least one lesson per cycle that integrates a systematic check for understanding (exit ticket, targeted questioning, whiteboard responses)	Nov–Jan
MOY check-in: PLC teams share one example of how student data from a check for understanding changed their next instructional move (lightning round protocol at faculty meeting)	January 2027
Intervention Compass BOY training for all instructional staff; teachers use dashboard to link classroom data to student profiles	October 2026
SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR (February 2027 – June 2027)	
PLCs shift to refine cycles: teams implement an agreed-upon explicit modeling technique for one full unit, collect student work evidence, and debrief impact in the next PLC meeting	Feb–April 2027
Peer observation cycle #2: teachers observe a colleague implementing a systematic check for understanding and provide structured written feedback using the building's observation protocol	March 2027
EOY Intervention Compass training; teams review whether students who received targeted supports after checks for understanding demonstrated growth on EOY assessments	May 2027
PLC teams complete an "Impact Story" (1-page summary) documenting: the explicit modeling strategy tried, evidence collected, and what they will carry forward next year	June 2027

Key Strategy 2: Building Purposeful Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR (September 2026 – January 2027)

Kick off PLCs with district-wide professional learning on PLC purpose and structure (DCIP Action 1, Phase 1); use faculty meeting to introduce shared vocabulary and non-negotiable meeting norms	September 2026
Each PLC team completes a "Starting Line" self-assessment: Where are we now in our collaborative practice? Results inform team-specific goals for the year	October 2026
Director of Curriculum facilitates a mid-cycle "PLC Tune-Up" session for team leads: troubleshoot facilitation barriers, share effective protocols across teams, reinforce the instructional focus of meetings	November 2026
BOY staff survey on PLC comfort and familiarity administered; results shared with staff and used to adapt support (DCIP data collection target)	October 2026
Teams pilot one structured protocol (e.g., "Four A's Text Protocol" on student work, or "Tuning Protocol" on an upcoming lesson) and report back to faculty on what they learned	Nov–Dec 2026
SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR (February 2027 – June 2027)	
MOY survey administered (January 2027); results reviewed by SCEP team and shared with faculty — celebrate growth, identify teams still needing facilitation support	January 2027
Begin structural planning for middle school PLC pilot (per DCIP Action 1, Phase 2): building leadership reviews scheduling options and shares 2–3 models with staff for feedback	February 2027
Teams that have demonstrated strong PLC practice are designated "Learning Partners" and host at least one cross-team learning visit per semester	March–April 2027
EOY survey administered; results documented and used to inform 2027–28 PLC calendar and structure (meeting schedule set by May 2027 per DCIP)	May–June 2027
SCEP team reviews full year of PLC documentation (agendas, notes, student data discussed) to assess coherence and identify gaps for next year's plan	June 2027

Progress Monitoring

Key Strategy 1: Explicit Modeling and Systematic Checks for Understanding

	Early Progress Indicators (set in advance)	Mid-Year Indicators (complete after Q1)	End-of-Year Indicators (complete midyear)
Evidence of Student Learning Improving	Students in observed classrooms can articulate what they are learning and why.		

	Exit ticket completion rates above 80% in PLCs reporting use of the strategy.		
Evidence of Teacher Practice Changing	At least 50% of PLCs document use of check-for-understanding data in their meeting notes by November 2026. Coaching debrief logs show teachers can name the explicit modeling component they used.		

	End-of-the-Year Vision (set in advance)	Mid-Year Reassessment (update midyear)
Students will be...	...able to explain what they are learning and how they know when they understand it. Student survey responses to Q.1 (thinking deeply) and Q.3 (supported without removing challenge) will increase by at least 5 percentage points compared to Spring 2026 baseline (63% and 59% favorable respectively).	
Teachers will be...	...consistently using at least two of the "Vital Few" practices in observed lessons. Teacher survey favorable rate on Q.4 (PD reinforced through coaching and collaboration) will rise from 23% to at least 40%. PLC meeting notes show data from checks for understanding driving planning decisions in 80% of documented cycles.	

Survey Monitoring – Key Strategy 1

Survey Question	SD	D	N	A	SA	IDK
Q1: What I learn in professional development is reinforced through coaching and collaborative team time. (Teacher Q.4)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Teacher)	8%	41%	28%	13%	5%	5%

26-27 Needs Assessment						
Q2: The tasks and activities we give students require them to think deeply, reason, and make meaning, rather than just recall information. (Teacher Q.16)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Teacher)	3%	8%	31%	49%	5%	5%
26-27 Needs Assessment						

Key Strategy 2: Building Purposeful PLCs

	Early Progress Indicators (set in advance)	Mid-Year Indicators (complete after Q1)	End-of-Year Indicators (complete midyear)
Evidence of Student Learning Improving	PLC teams can show student work evidence shared and discussed in at least 2 of every 3 meeting cycles. No student whose name appears on the "at-risk" list lacks a documented adult advocate.		
Evidence of Teacher Practice Changing	100% of PLC teams have completed and returned their "Starting Line" self-assessment by October 2026. Agendas for bi-weekly meetings show instructional focus (not logistics) in at least 80% of meetings.		

	End-of-the-Year Vision (set in advance)	Mid-Year Reassessment (update midyear)
Students will be...	...benefiting from PLCs that use data to identify and support them proactively. The teacher survey favorable rate on Q.24 (students seldom slip through the cracks) will rise from 21% toward 35%.	

Teachers will be...	...engaged in PLCs that stay focused on instruction. Teacher survey favorable rate on Q.9 (meetings focused on teaching and learning) will rise from 28% to at least 45%. Q.3 (PL connects to instructional priorities) will rise from 31% to at least 50%. BOY-to-EOY staff survey shows 20%+ increase in positive responses on PLC comfort (DCIP SMARTIE Goal).	
----------------------------	---	--

Survey Monitoring – Key Strategy 2

Survey Question	SD	D	N	A	SA	IDK
Q1: Our team meetings stay focused on improving teaching and learning, not just on logistics or compliance tasks. (Teacher Q.9)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Teacher)	8%	31%	33%	23%	3%	3%
26-27 Needs Assessment						
Q2: Professional learning during staff meetings, superintendent conference days, and pull-out sessions connect to our ongoing instructional priorities. (Teacher Q.3)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Teacher)	3%	28%	38%	18%	8%	5%
26-27 Needs Assessment						

Part 3: Schoolwide Core Structures

Instructional Leadership Team – Rigorous, Standards-Aligned Instruction

These structures describe the routines the building-level team uses to ensure that all students receive rigorous, standards-aligned instruction.

What structures and routines will support this in 2026-27?	Description	New / Refine
<p>ILT Core Structure 1: Monthly Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Meeting with Curriculum and Instruction Focus</p> <p>When and how often: Monthly, 60 minutes. Typically the first Wednesday of each month. Led by Principal with Director of Curriculum, BOCES Liaison, and department leads.</p>	<p>The ILT meets monthly to review: (a) evidence of Key Strategy implementation from PLC documentation and coaching logs; (b) patterns from classroom observations using the "Look For" tool; (c) student performance data from Intervention Compass (once trained per DCIP); and (d) curriculum pacing and task quality across departments. The ILT identifies 1–2 instructional adjustments per month and communicates them to department leads for relay to PLCs. This structure directly supports the district's Data Dashboard goal (DCIP Action, Rigorous Instruction) by linking classroom evidence to building-level decisions. Teacher survey data show that only 36% feel the vision for instruction is consistently reinforced (Teacher Q.13)—this structure directly addresses that gap.</p>	<p>REFINE</p>
<p>ILT Core Structure 2: Classroom Observation and Feedback Cycle Aligned to Key Strategies</p> <p>When and how often: Principal and Director of Curriculum conduct informal observations 2x per month per teacher. Formal observation debrief cycle 1x per quarter.</p>	<p>Observations are anchored to the two Key Strategies. The "Look For" tool (DCIP Action 2, due January 2027) will be used consistently once available; until then, leadership uses a building-developed look-for protocol focused on: (1) Is there an explicit model/think-aloud? (2) Is there a check for understanding with a student response system? (3) Does teacher data from the check inform next steps? Observations feed into monthly ILT discussions. Family survey data indicate only 47% of families feel the school provides a consistent experience across teachers (Family Q.14), and student data show only 31% feel challenge is consistent across classes (Student Q.2). This observation cycle is designed to reduce that instructional variability.</p>	<p>REFINE</p>

<p>What will the ILT do to evaluate Key Strategy 1?</p>	<p>Review coaching debrief logs and PLC meeting notes monthly for evidence of</p>
--	---

	Explicit Modeling and Checks for Understanding. Administer student focus group (3–4 students per grade) in January to hear how students describe their learning experience. Triangulate with Intervention Compass data to see whether check-for-understanding data correlates with improved student trajectories.
What will the ILT do to evaluate Key Strategy 2?	Conduct quarterly "PLC Health Check" using a 3-item rubric: (1) meetings focused on instruction, (2) student data discussed, (3) next steps documented. Review BOY and EOY staff survey results on PLC questions. Compare pre/post on Teacher Q.9 and Q.3. Report findings to full staff in June.

Survey Monitoring – Instructional Leadership / Rigorous Instruction

Survey Question	SD	D	N	A	SA	IDK
Q1: The vision for high-quality instruction and the teaching practices valued at the school are reinforced consistently through planning meetings, feedback, and leadership communication. (Teacher Q.13)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Teacher / Family)	13%	31%	21%	31%	0%	5%
26-27 Needs Assessment						
Q2: Overall, I believe this school provides a consistent and supportive experience for all students, not just depending on which teacher they have. (Family Q.14)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Teacher / Family)	8%	17%	29%	26%	18%	3%
26-27 Needs Assessment						

Every Student Thrives Core Structures

These structures describe the routines a building-level team uses to ensure that student supports are coherent, equitable, and aligned across the school.

What structures and routines will support this in 2026-27?	Description	New / Refine
EST Core Structure 1:	The MTSS team (counselors, psychologist, interventionists, administrator) meets monthly to review student-level data from	REFINE

<p>MTSS Student Support Team – Monthly Review with Transition Focus</p> <p>When and how often: Monthly MTSS team meetings (60 min) using a consistent meeting protocol. Quarterly equity reviews disaggregating data by subgroup.</p>	<p>Intervention Compass, including academic, attendance, and behavioral indicators. A consistent meeting protocol ensures every student on a watch list has a named adult advocate. The team uses a coordinated student support identification process with clear entry points so no student slips through the cracks. Teacher survey data show that only 21% agree students seldom slip through the cracks (Teacher Q.24), making this a critical priority. The team also leads vertical alignment sessions for grades 5-6 and 8-9 transitions (DCIP Action 1, Every Student Thrives), ensuring receiving teachers have student context before transitions occur. Intervention resource documents are developed and shared with teachers and families (DCIP SMARTIE goal: January 2027). Middle school faculty voice (April 2026) strongly amplifies this structure: staff expressed deep concern that students with extreme absence levels (e.g., 50+ days) are still promoted, and that students are "passed along even if they haven't been successful." The MTSS team will maintain consistent guidance around retention aligned to DCIP and district policy. Faculty also requested a weekly advisory period and conversion of 6th grade study hall into a counselor/social worker-led seminar focused on everyday skills, organizational habits, and character development—directly aligned to DCIP Action 2 (Tier 1 Toolkit for Grades 6–8). The MTSS team will coordinate with the principal to explore a 6th grade advisory model for 2026-27, using the Tier 1 Toolkit materials (Checklist for Success, graphic organizers, agenda books) as the curriculum anchor.</p>	
<p>EST Core Structure 2: Schoolwide Consistency Audit for Expectations and Belonging</p> <p>When and how often: Twice yearly (October and March): student focus groups + staff survey data review. ILT presents findings to full staff.</p>	<p>The Tier 1 Toolkit (graphic organizers, agenda books, Checklist for Success—DCIP Action 2) gives students consistent organizational tools as they transition between buildings. The school reviews the Checklist for Success with incoming Grade 6 students in September and Grade 9 students in September. The ILT uses student survey data to monitor belonging and equity. Key baselines from Spring 2026: only 30% of high school students report that adults treat all students fairly</p>	<p>NEW</p>

	<p>(Student Q.6); only 46% say the school respects and values students like them (Student Q.11). The team will analyze these results by subgroup at MOY and EOY and report progress at monthly ILT meetings. Family engagement on these issues is maintained through ParentSquare communications at key transition points. Middle school faculty voice (April 2026) adds critical urgency here: staff cited inconsistent enforcement of expectations across classrooms and staff as a top concern, flagging that students experience "different rules depending on who is involved." Faculty overwhelmingly supported a middle school-specific code of conduct, consistent use of restorative practices (rather than only punitive responses), common language around expectations through a PBIS framework, and grade-level celebrations and positive behavior reinforcement. Faculty also raised concerns about phone use (Yonder pouches not being consistently enforced) and students in hallways avoiding class. This structure directly addresses the consistency gap by establishing a shared behavioral framework reviewed by the ILT quarterly. The SCEP team will explore a PBIS alignment process in Fall 2026, connecting behavioral expectations to the academic Tier 1 Toolkit for a unified student experience.</p>	
--	--	--

Survey Monitoring – Every Student Thrives

Survey Question	SD	D	N	A	SA	IDK
Q1: Students seldom, if ever, slip through the cracks at this school. (Teacher Q.24)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Teacher / Student)	15%	33%	31%	18%	3%	0%
26-27 Needs Assessment						
Q2: Adults at this school treat all students fairly and believe we can all do well. (Student Q.6)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Teacher / Student)	19%	22%	30%	23%	7%	0%

26-27 Needs Assessment						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Attendance Core Structures

These structures describe the routines a building-level team uses to ensure that attendance is monitored proactively, addressed early, and supported through coordinated schoolwide practices.

What structures and routines will support this in 2026-27?	Description	New / Refine
<p>Attendance Core Structure 1: Tiered Attendance Monitoring and Response Protocol</p> <p>When and how often: Weekly data pulls from SMS and Intervention Compass (every Monday). Monthly attendance subcommittee review aligned to DCIP Action 1 (Attendance). BOY baseline established by October 2026.</p>	<p>The school implements the district's three-tier attendance response aligned to the DCIP: Tier I – universal monitoring and proactive communication for all students; Tier II – targeted outreach (counselor contact, ParentSquare message, phone call) when a student reaches 3+ absences in 30 days; Tier III – intensive intervention (home visit, referral to MTSS team, community agency connection) for students approaching or exceeding 10% absence rate. Family survey data are encouraging: 79% of families report the school communicates clearly about attendance expectations (Family Q.15), but only 53% say the school reaches out to understand why their child missed school (Family Q.16), identifying this as an area for growth. All Tier II/III interventions are logged in Intervention Compass. The subcommittee reviews logs monthly to ensure documentation and follow-through. SMARTIE goal: 3% reduction in chronic absenteeism by June 2027. Middle school faculty voice (April 2026) identified several specific, actionable attendance concerns that this structure must address: (1) Inconsistent handling of attendance concerns in the main office — the subcommittee will establish a clear, written office protocol for attendance response with defined response windows; (2) Students "disappearing mid-class" with no accountability — building will implement a consistent pass restriction/limit policy and explore auto-generation of skip write-ups via SchoolTool when a student is coded as a skip; (3) Disruptions from frequent early releases called by families — the office will establish a communication protocol to batch early-release notifications and reduce</p>	<p>REFINE</p>

	<p>instructional interruptions; (4) Access to field trips and extracurriculars tied to satisfactory attendance — the building will develop a clear, written policy linking attendance thresholds to activity eligibility, consistent with faculty group-supported requests; (5) Seat time requirements as an expectation — communicated consistently to students, families, and staff at the start of the year.</p>	
<p>Attendance Core Structure 2: Re-entry and Belonging Protocol for Students Returning After Absence</p> <p>When and how often: Activated within 24 hours of any student returning after 3+ consecutive absences. Counselor check-in same day. Brief teacher "welcome back" protocol shared at opening faculty meeting.</p>	<p>Upon return from an extended absence (3+ days), the school counselor conducts a brief check-in to: (1) understand the reason for absence and remove any barriers before they recur; (2) help the student create a catch-up plan with teachers; and (3) connect the student to any needed mental health or academic supports. Teacher survey data indicate that 69% feel students are welcomed back without stigma (Teacher Q.43), but only 50% of families report the school helps their child reengage with learning after absence (Family Q.18), and only 43% of students report someone checks in to understand their absence (Student Q.13). This structure directly addresses those gaps. The protocol also establishes a consistent "no-shame" tardy response so students who arrive late still attend class (consistent with DCIP Attendance guidance). Teachers receive the re-entry protocol at the August SCD and review it in October after BOY data are available.</p> <p>Middle school faculty voice (April 2026) adds important nuance: staff noted that tardy handling may inadvertently discourage late-arriving students from entering class at all ("no accountability for lateness" was cited, but paired with the concern that punitive responses backfire). The re-entry protocol will be designed explicitly to welcome students in without drawing negative attention, while maintaining a clear record. Faculty also flagged bathroom use as a disruptive pattern — the protocol will include a clear, consistent pass policy shared with all staff and students at the start of the year, reducing the ambiguity that currently drives inconsistency.</p>	<p>NEW</p>

Attendance Monitoring

Average Monthly Daily Attendance	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May
2025-26	93.81	92.60	91.81	89.68	90.47	87.81	91.67	93.25	90.72
2026-27									

Note: Record monthly average daily attendance as data become available throughout the year. A BOY chronic absenteeism baseline will follow NYSED guidelines.

Survey Monitoring – Attendance

Survey Question	SD	D	N	A	SA	IDK
Q1: If my child misses school, the school reaches out to understand why, not just to report the absence. (Family Q.16)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Family / Student)	11%	20%	17%	33%	17%	3%
26-27 Needs Assessment						
Q2: If I miss school, someone checks in to understand what's going on. (Student Q.13)						
25-26 Needs Assessment (Family / Student)	17%	21%	19%	27%	9%	7%
26-27 Needs Assessment						

Our Team's Process

Team Collaboration

Name	Role	Orientati on to School Teams	Meeting 1: Systems & Structures Self-Assessme nt	Meetin g 2: Teache r Survey Review	Meeting 3: Variation s in Data	Meeting 4: Student Interview s	Meeting 4A: Family Focus Groups (optiona l)	Meetin g 5: Plan Writing	Meeting 6: Plan Finalizatio n
Matthew Wright	Director of Curriculum and PPS		X	X	X			X	X
David Russell	Jr./Sr. High School Principal		X	X	X	X		X	X
Sharon Swain	BOCES Liaison	X	X		X				X
Adriene Bush	Teacher		X	X	X			X	X
Kelly Fagnani	School Psych		X	X	X			X	X
Brittany Heintz	Teacher – Special Education		X	X	X			X	X
Carey Raymond	Teacher – Special Education		X	X	X			X	X
Katherine Skaar	Teacher		X	X	X			X	X
Rylie Smith	Teacher		X	X	X			X	X
Gabrielle Warren	School Counselor		X	X	X			X	X
Michele Sherer	Parent		X						X
Curt Dutcher	Parent		X					X	X

Next Steps

Sharing the Plan

By Early June: Share the initial draft with the SCEP liaison for SCEP Development Check-In 3.

Before the Last Day of School (2025-26): Incorporate feedback and complete all remaining sections. Send the full plan to the liaison for SCEP Development Check-In 4.

No Later than the First Day of School (2026-27): The plan must be approved by the Superintendent and Board of Education and posted to the district website.

Implementing the Plan

The SCEP team will reconvene quarterly to review Early Progress Indicators and Mid-Year Indicators. The principal will meet with the assigned liaison after Q1 and Q2 to discuss implementation. Adjustments to the plan are expected based on evidence of impact collected through PLC documentation, coaching logs, Intervention Compass data, and survey results.

