Annual School Performance Summary and Improvement Priorities
Arkansas Connections Academy
2025–2026 Reflection and 2026–2027 Plan

School Context and Year-in-Review

Arkansas Connections Academy (ARCA) serves a diverse population of K–12 students in a virtual learning environment, requiring strong systems of instructional delivery, student engagement, and progress monitoring to ensure academic success. Over the past academic year, the school has focused on improving student outcomes in English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, and high school graduation attainment. A review of performance data indicates that while systems for instruction and support are in place, student growth and proficiency outcomes remain below desired targets, particularly in middle school ELA and Math and in advanced diploma attainment in high school.

In ELA, 46.65% of students are currently meeting expected growth benchmarks, highlighting a need for stronger Tier 1 instruction, more consistent PLC implementation, and more effective intervention systems. PLC structures have been inconsistently implemented, with approximately 40% of teams completing full instructional cycles with fidelity, limiting the school's ability to systematically respond to student data. Additionally, only about 35% of students receiving targeted intervention are demonstrating sufficient growth, indicating that differentiation and intervention practices require refinement and stronger monitoring systems.

Similarly, in Mathematics, only 44.42% of students are meeting expected growth benchmarks, demonstrating a parallel need to strengthen Tier 1 instructional practices, improve collaborative planning through PLCs, and implement more effective targeted interventions. Middle school math performance remains a key area of concern, as foundational skill gaps continue to impact students' ability to meet grade-level expectations and demonstrate growth on ATLAS-aligned assessments.

At the high school level, the current 4-year graduation rate stands at 78.97%, which falls below the desired target of 85%. In addition, only 6.4% of graduating students earn a merit or distinction diploma, indicating limited access to or success in rigorous coursework pathways. While many students are completing graduation requirements, fewer are doing so at advanced levels that reflect college and career readiness. Contributing factors include inconsistent monitoring of at-risk students, gaps in credit attainment systems, and limited structured support for students pursuing advanced diploma pathways.

Across all three priority areas, several common themes emerge. First, there is a need for stronger instructional leadership to ensure consistent, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction. Second, PLCs must function as high-impact systems for data-driven planning and instructional adjustment. Third, targeted intervention and student support systems must be more systematically implemented and monitored to ensure all students, especially those most at risk, demonstrate measurable growth.

In response to these findings, ARCA is prioritizing a focused improvement strategy centered on strengthening instructional leadership, ensuring high-functioning PLCs, and implementing responsive intervention systems across content areas, while also building robust systems for tracking graduation progress and expanding access to rigorous coursework. These efforts are designed to create a cohesive, data-driven system that improves student growth, increases proficiency, and ensures more students graduate on time and are prepared for postsecondary success.

Retrospective Reflection on 2025–2026

During the 2025–2026 school year, Arkansas Connections Academy (ARCA) made intentional progress toward strengthening systems that support student growth, instructional consistency, and graduation outcomes. The school prioritized improving Tier 1 instruction, building more structured PLCs, and increasing targeted support for students. Leadership did not ensure consistent implementation across these areas, and as a result, student outcomes fell short of our targets.

In English Language Arts (ELA), efforts to improve instructional quality through walkthroughs, coaching, and data analysis resulted in increased awareness of standards, alignment, and rigor. Some PLC teams demonstrated strong practices in unpacking standards and using student work to guide instruction. However, these practices were not consistently implemented across all grade levels, particularly in Grades 6–8, where student growth remained below desired levels. Intervention systems were established but lacked consistency in progress monitoring and instructional alignment, limiting their overall effectiveness.

In Mathematics, similar trends were observed. While teachers engaged in curriculum implementation and formative assessment practices, there was variability in the level of rigor, conceptual instruction, and use of data to drive decisions. Leadership allowed PLC meetings to operate as compliance exercises rather than holding teams to the standard of high-impact instructional planning. We did not monitor or intervene early enough when PLC quality fell short. As a result, student growth in mathematics did not meet targets, especially among students with foundational skill gaps.

At the high school level, the school maintained a graduation rate of 78.97%, demonstrating a stable but insufficient level of student completion. Leadership did not ensure that at-risk identification systems were used consistently or that interventions followed in a timely way. That failure contributed directly to students not graduating on time. Additionally, while some students accessed advanced coursework opportunities, there was not a cohesive system to intentionally increase enrollment and success in merit and distinction diploma pathways. This resulted in a low percentage of students earning advanced diplomas.

Across all content areas and grade levels, a key theme was the need for stronger system coherence and accountability. While structures such as PLCs, intervention blocks, and instructional monitoring existed, their impact was limited by inconsistent implementation and lack of clear expectations. Leadership recognized that simply having systems in place is insufficient; those systems must be executed with fidelity, monitored regularly, and adjusted based on data.

Despite these challenges, the 2025–2026 school year gave leadership critical clarity on what we failed to execute. We did not hold ourselves or our teams to a high enough standard of consistency, and that gap in leadership follow-through directly limited what students were able to achieve.Leadership takes responsibility for the gaps in execution described above. The goals and driver metrics in this plan are a direct response to what we did not do well enough in 2025–2026, and we are committing to a higher standard of follow-through in the year ahead.

Moving forward, ARCA is positioned to build on these lessons by increasing accountability, improving consistency across classrooms, and ensuring that all instructional and support systems are aligned to measurable student outcomes. The reflection from this year has directly informed the development of clear, targeted goals for 2026–2027, with a focus on accelerating student growth, increasing proficiency, and improving graduation and diploma attainment outcomes.

Priority Goal 1: Increase ELA Growth

Increase the average Growth Score on the ATLAS Summative Assessment in ELA for all tested grades by 8.35 points, from the current average gain of 46.65% to 55%, by the end of the 2026-2027 school year, with a specific focus on increasing the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in Grades 6-8 ELA.

Measurement definition block

Driver 1: Strengthen Instructional Leadership to Improve Tier 1 ELA Practices

 Why this driver matters: Strong administrative focus on instructional quality ensures that Tier 1 ELA instruction is consistently aligned to standards, rigorous, and responsive to student data. Through ongoing monitoring, feedback, and support, school leaders directly influence instructional effectiveness, which leads to increased student proficiency and growth on the ATLAS ELA assessment, particularly in Grades 6–8.

 Metric: Percentage of ELA classroom observations where Tier 1 instruction meets the school's defined instructional expectations, as measured by the walkthrough tool.

 Definition: A student is counted as meeting the metric if they demonstrate at least one year's worth of growth (or meet projected growth targets) on district or state-aligned interim ELA assessments administered throughout the year.

 Baseline: 46.65% of students currently meeting expected growth benchmarks in ELA.

 Target:

- Fall Interim: 48% meeting growth targets
- Winter Interim: 52% meeting growth targets
- Spring Summative ATLAS Assessment: 55% meeting growth targets

 Evidence source: District interim assessment reports, ATLAS practice assessments, and student growth reports from the assessment platform.

 Review cadence: Reviewed after each interim assessment window (quarterly) by the principal, instructional leadership team, and ELA PLCs.

 Leadership response if off track:

- Conduct instructional walkthroughs focused on ELA standards alignment and rigor
- Provide targeted coaching and modeling for ELA teachers
- Adjust pacing guides and reteach plans based on identified skill gaps
- Ensure appropriate implementation of Tier 1 supports for students not meeting growth targets
- Increase accountability by requiring teachers in need of support to meet regularly with literacy coaches and specialists
- Monitor progress bi-weekly until improvement is demonstrated

Driver 2: Implement Structured PLC Cycles Focused on Instructional Planning, Data Analysis, and Responsive Teaching

 Why this driver matters: Consistent, high-functioning Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) ensure that ELA instruction is not left to individual variability. Structured PLCs create a system for teachers to collaboratively unpack standards, analyze student work, plan rigorous lessons, and respond to data in real time. This directly strengthens classroom implementation and ensures alignment across Grades 6–8, leading to increased student growth and proficiency.

 Metric: Percentage of PLC cycles completed with documented evidence of standards-based planning, common assessments, data analysis, and instructional adjustments.

 Definition: A PLC cycle is considered complete when the team has:

1. Unpacked priority ELA standards of HQIM
2. Developed and administered a common formative assessment focused on writing outcomes
3. Analyzed student work, written response, and data
4. Created and implemented a reteach/enrichment plan
5. Documented actions and next steps in PLC artifacts

 Baseline: Inconsistent PLC implementation; estimated 40% of PLCs completing full instructional cycles with fidelity.

 Target:

- Fall: 70% of PLCs completing full cycles with fidelity
- Winter: 85% of PLCs completing full cycles with fidelity
- Spring: 100% of PLCs completing full cycles with fidelity

 Evidence source: PLC agendas, meeting notes, common assessment artifacts, data analysis protocols, and instructional planning documents.

 Review cadence: Reviewed bi-weekly by instructional coaches and monthly by the principal and leadership team.

 Leadership response if off track: If PLC implementation is inconsistent or incomplete, leadership will:

- Provide clear PLC structures, protocols, and expectations
- Facilitate or model PLC meetings to build team capacity
- Provide targeted professional development on data analysis and instructional planning
- Increase accountability through regular artifact reviews and feedback
- Adjust schedules or provide additional time to ensure PLC effectiveness

Driver 3: Targeted Intervention and Differentiation

 Why this driver matters: While strong Tier 1 instruction is essential, a significant percentage of students, particularly in Grades 6–8, require additional targeted support to meet proficiency. Systematic intervention and intentional differentiation ensure that instruction is responsive to individual student needs, accelerating growth for students performing below grade level while extending learning for those already proficient.

 Metric: Percentage of identified students receiving targeted intervention who demonstrate measurable growth on skill-specific ELA assessments.

 Definition: A student is counted as meeting the metric if they:

- Are identified for Tier 2 or Tier 3 ELA support based on assessment data, and
- Demonstrate improvement on progress monitoring measures (e.g., mastery of targeted standards or growth on interim/diagnostic assessments) within a defined intervention cycle (6–8 weeks)

 Baseline: Approximately 35% of students receiving intervention demonstrate sufficient growth on targeted ELA skills.

 Target:

- Fall: 50% of identified students show measurable growth

- Winter: 60% of identified students show measurable growth
- Spring: 70% of identified students show measurable growth

 Evidence source: Progress monitoring tools (e.g., diagnostic assessments, curriculum-based measures), intervention group rosters, student data trackers, and interim assessment reports.
 Review cadence: Reviewed every 6–8 weeks by interventionists, ELA teachers, and instructional coaches; monitored monthly by school leadership.
 Leadership response if off track: If intervention efforts are not producing expected growth, leadership will:

- Audit intervention groups for appropriate student placement and group size
- Adjust intervention materials and strategies to better align with identified skill deficits
- Provide professional development on differentiation and scaffolding strategies
- Increase frequency or duration of intervention blocks for targeted students
- Ensure fidelity of implementation through walkthroughs and data reviews
- Reassign resources (staffing, time, supports) to prioritize highest-need students

Outcome measure

✔ **Primary outcome metric:** Primary outcome metric: Percentage of students meeting or exceeding expected growth benchmarks on the ATLAS ELA Summative Assessment

✔ **Baseline:** 46.65% of students meeting expected growth benchmarks in ELA

✔ **Target:** 55% of students meeting or exceeding proficiency/growth expectations by Spring (aligned to interim target)

✔ **Midyear progress check:** The school will be considered on track if:

- At least 52% of students meet growth targets on Winter interim assessments, and
- PLC cycles are being implemented with at least 85% fidelity, and
- At least 60% of intervention students demonstrate measurable growth

These indicators show that Tier 1 instruction, PLC effectiveness, and interventions are improving in alignment with the drivers.

✔ **Success judgment: The goal will be considered met if:**

- 55% or more of students meet expected growth and/or proficiency benchmarks on Spring interim/ATLAS-aligned assessments, and
- Supporting driver metrics are achieved (PLC fidelity at 100% and intervention growth at 70%), confirming that gains are systemic and sustainable rather than isolated.

Priority Goal 2: Math Growth (Grades 6–8 Focus)

Increase ATLAS Math growth from 44.42% to 55% (+10.58) by 2026–2027, with a focus on improving Grades 6–8 proficiency. Current data shows students are not consistently meeting growth targets, especially in middle school. To address this, the school will strengthen Tier 1 instruction, implement consistent data-driven PLCs, and expand targeted intervention and differentiation to ensure instruction is aligned and responsive across classrooms.

Measurement definition block

Driver 1: Strengthen Instructional Leadership to Improve Tier 1 Math Practices

 Why this driver matters: Strong instructional leadership ensures that Tier 1 math instruction is standards-aligned, conceptually rigorous, and focused on problem-solving and mathematical reasoning. Consistent monitoring and feedback improve instructional quality, leading directly to increased student growth.

 Metric: Percentage of math classroom observations where Tier 1 instruction meets the school's defined instructional expectations, as measured by the walkthrough tool

 Definition: A student meets the metric if they demonstrate at least one year's worth of growth or meet projected growth targets on interim math assessments

 Baseline: 44.42% of students meeting expected growth benchmarks in Mathematics

 Target:

- Fall Interim: 47% meeting growth targets
- Winter Interim: 51% meeting growth targets
- Spring Summative ATLAS Assessment: 55% meeting growth targets

 Evidence source: District interim assessment reports, math benchmark assessments, and ATLAS-aligned practice assessments

 Review cadence: Reviewed after each interim assessment window (quarterly) by the principal, instructional leadership team, and Math PLCs

 Leadership response if off track:

- Conduct focused instructional walkthroughs on math rigor and standards alignment
- Provide targeted coaching on mathematical discourse and problem-solving strategies
- Adjust pacing guides and reteach plans based on data
- Increase monitoring and require regular coaching cycles for identified teachers
- Conduct bi-weekly data reviews until improvement is demonstrated

Driver 2: Implement Structured PLC Cycles Focused on Math Instruction and Data Analysis

 Why this driver matters: Effective PLCs ensure consistent instructional planning, alignment to standards, and real-time response to student data. This reduces variability across classrooms and strengthens math instruction schoolwide.

 Metric: Percentage of PLC cycles completed with documented evidence of standards-based planning, common assessments, data analysis, and instructional adjustments

 Definition: A PLC cycle is complete when the team has:

- Unpacked priority math standards
- Developed and administered a common formative assessment
- Analyzed student work and data
- Created and implemented reteach/enrichment plans
- Documented actions and next steps

 Baseline: 40% of PLCs completing full instructional cycles with fidelity

 Target:

- Fall: 70% of PLCs completing full cycles
- Winter: 85% of PLCs completing full cycles
- Spring: 100% of PLCs completing full cycles

 Evidence source: PLC agendas, meeting notes, common assessments, and instructional planning artifacts

 Review cadence: Reviewed bi-weekly by instructional coaches and monthly by the principal and leadership team

 Leadership response if off track:

- Provide clear PLC protocols and expectations
- Model effective PLC meetings
- Provide professional development on math data analysis and instructional planning
- Increase accountability through artifact reviews and feedback
- Adjust schedules to ensure protected PLC time

Driver 3: Targeted Math Intervention and Differentiation Beyond Tier I

 Why this driver matters: Many students require additional support beyond Tier 1 instruction to master foundational math skills. Targeted intervention ensures gaps are addressed, while differentiation supports acceleration for advanced learners.

 Metric: Percentage of identified students receiving math intervention who demonstrate measurable growth on skill-specific assessments

 Definition: A student meets the metric if they:

- Are identified for Tier 2 or Tier 3 math support, and
- Demonstrate measurable improvement on progress monitoring tools within a 6–8 week cycle

 Baseline: 35% of students receiving intervention demonstrate sufficient growth

 Target:

- Fall: 50% of identified students show growth
- Winter: 60% of identified students show growth
- Spring: 70% of identified students show growth

 Evidence source: Progress monitoring assessments, intervention logs, student data trackers, and interim assessment reports

 Review cadence: Reviewed every 6–8 weeks by interventionists and teachers; monitored monthly by leadership

 Leadership response if off track:

- Audit intervention groups for placement and effectiveness
- Adjust instructional strategies and materials
- Provide PD on differentiation and scaffolding
- Increase intervention time or frequency
- Reallocate staffing/resources to high-need students
- Monitor fidelity through walkthroughs and data checks

Outcome measure

✔ **Primary outcome metric:** Average Growth Score on the ATLAS Summative Assessment in Mathematics

✔ **Baseline:** 44.42% average growth score

✔ **Target:** 55% average growth score by Spring 2027

✔ **Midyear progress check:** The school will be on track if:

- At least 51% of students meet growth targets on Winter interim assessments, and
- PLC implementation reaches 85% fidelity, and
- At least 60% of intervention students demonstrate measurable growth

✔ **Success judgment:** The goal will be considered met if:

- The school achieves 55% or higher average growth on the ATLAS Math assessment, and
- Supporting driver metrics are met, confirming sustained and systemic instructional improvement

Priority Goal 3: Graduation and Diploma Attainment (On-Time & Distinction Focus)

Increase the 4-year on-time graduation rate to 85% from 78.97% and increase the percentage of graduating students earning a merit or distinction diploma from 6.4% to 35% by the end of the 2026–2027 school year. Improving graduation rates and increasing merit/distinction diplomas is essential for postsecondary readiness. While many students graduate, few do so at levels reflecting college and career readiness. To achieve this, the school will strengthen early identification and monitoring, improve credit attainment systems, and expand access to rigorous coursework and support for earning advanced diplomas.

Measurement definition block

Driver 1: Early Identification and Monitoring of At-Risk Students

 Why this driver matters: Students who fall off track for graduation often show early warning signs such as course failures, low attendance, or lack of engagement. Proactive identification and consistent monitoring allow for timely interventions that prevent students from falling behind.

 Metric: Percentage of students identified as at-risk who are actively monitored and have documented intervention plans

 Definition: A student is counted as at-risk if they:

- Are identified using early warning indicators (course failures, attendance, engagement), and
- Have a documented intervention plan with progress monitoring updated at least monthly

 Baseline: 50% of identified at-risk students currently have consistent monitoring and intervention plans

 Target:

- Fall: 75% of at-risk students monitored with plans
- Winter: 90% of at-risk students monitored with plans
- Spring: 100% of at-risk students monitored with plans

 Evidence source: Student information system (SIS), early warning reports, intervention logs, and counselor documentation

 Review cadence: Reviewed bi-weekly by counselors and graduation teams; monitored monthly by school leadership

 Leadership response if off track:

- Implement standardized early warning tracking systems
- Assign staff to monitor specific cohorts of at-risk students
- Increase frequency of student check-ins and family communication
- Provide training on intervention planning and progress monitoring
- Conduct weekly audits of at-risk student data

Driver 2: Strengthen Credit Attainment and On-Track Systems

 Why this driver matters: Students must consistently earn credits each year to graduate on time. Clear tracking systems and timely recovery options ensure students remain on pace toward graduation.

 Metric: Percentage of students on track for graduation based on grade-level credit attainment benchmarks

 Definition: A student is considered on track if they have earned the required number of credits for their grade level

 Baseline: 73% of students are currently on track for graduation based on credit attainment

 Target:

- Fall: 75% on track
- Winter: 80% on track
- Spring: 85% on track

 Evidence source: Transcript audits, SIS credit reports, graduation tracking dashboards

 Review cadence: Reviewed monthly by counselors and department leadership; quarterly by administrative team

 Leadership response if off track:

- Expand credit recovery opportunities (online courses, extended learning)
- Adjust student schedules to prioritize credit completion
- Provide targeted academic support and tutoring
- Increase family communication regarding student progress
- Monitor course completion weekly for off-track students

Driver 3: Expand Access to Rigorous Coursework and Diploma Pathways

 Why this driver matters: Increasing merit and distinction diploma attainment requires students to successfully complete advanced coursework. Ensuring access, support, and encouragement for rigorous pathways increases both achievement and postsecondary readiness.

 Metric: Percentage of students enrolled in and successfully completing courses required for merit or distinction diploma pathways

 Definition: A student meets the metric if they:

- Are enrolled in qualifying advanced coursework (e.g., honors, concurrent credit, AP), and
- Successfully complete courses with passing grades aligned to diploma requirements

 Baseline: 6.4% of students earning merit or distinction diplomas

 Target:

- Fall: 10% of students on track for merit/distinction
- Winter: 15% of students on track
- Spring: 35% of students on track

 Evidence source: Course enrollment data, transcript reviews, graduation pathway tracking reports

 Review cadence: Reviewed quarterly by counselors and leadership; monitored during scheduling cycles

 Leadership response if off track:

- Increase student enrollment in advanced coursework
- Provide academic supports (tutoring, scaffolding, study sessions)
- Train teachers on supporting rigor for diverse learners
- Strengthen student advising and goal-setting processes
- Monitor course success rates and adjust supports as needed

Outcome measure

✔ **Primary outcome metric:** 4-year on-time graduation rate and percentage of students earning merit or distinction diplomas

✔ **Baseline:**

- Graduation rate: 78.97%
- Merit/Distinction diploma attainment: 6.4%

✔ **Target:**

- Graduation rate: 85%
- Merit/Distinction diploma attainment: Increase to 35%

✔ **Midyear progress check:** The school will be on track if:

- At least 80% of students are on track for graduation by Winter, and
- At least 90% of at-risk students have active intervention plans, and
- At least 15% of students are on track for merit/distinction diploma pathways

✔ **Success judgment:**

The goal will be considered met if:

- The school achieves an 85% or higher graduation rate, and
- Merit/distinction diploma attainment increases by at least 35%, and
- Supporting driver metrics demonstrate sustained systems for student success

Capacity-Building and Support Priorities

To successfully execute the identified goals in ELA, Mathematics, and Graduation/Diploma Attainment, ARCA will prioritize targeted capacity-building in instructional leadership, data-driven instruction, and student support systems. These priorities are directly aligned to the school's lowest baseline areas, including inconsistent PLC implementation (40% fidelity), low intervention effectiveness (35% growth), math growth (44.42%), and limited merit/distinction diploma attainment (6.4%).

First, the school will strengthen **instructional leadership capacity** by providing ongoing training and coaching for administrators focused on conducting high-quality instructional walkthroughs, delivering actionable feedback, and monitoring Tier 1 instructional rigor. Leaders will participate in collaborative sessions to ensure consistency in expectations across classrooms, particularly in Grades 6–8 ELA and Math, where performance gaps are most significant.

Second, ARCA will incorporate **high-functioning PLCs** as the primary structure for improving instruction. Teachers and instructional coaches will receive professional development on standards unpacking, data analysis protocols, and designing effective reteach and enrichment plans. PLC leads will be trained to facilitate meetings that move beyond compliance to true instructional problem-solving. Additional time and structured protocols will be provided to ensure PLCs reach full implementation fidelity.

Third, the school will enhance its **intervention and differentiation systems** by providing targeted professional development for teachers and interventionists on evidence-based strategies, progress monitoring, and flexible

grouping. Leadership will implement clear expectations for intervention cycles, including data tracking and accountability measures. Resources, including staffing and scheduling adjustments, will be prioritized to ensure students receive timely and effective support.

Finally, to improve graduation outcomes, ARCA will strengthen **student monitoring and academic advising systems**. Counselors and staff will receive training on early warning indicators, credit tracking, and individualized graduation planning. The school will expand access to advanced coursework and provide additional academic support to increase participation and success in merit and distinction diploma pathways.

These capacity-building efforts are designed to create sustainable systems that improve instructional quality, ensure consistent use of data, and provide targeted support to students, ultimately leading to improved academic outcomes and graduation success.

Governance and Monitoring Commitment

The ARCA Board and school leadership are committed to actively monitoring progress toward all priority goals through a structured, data-driven process. Progress on ELA, Mathematics, and Graduation/Diploma Attainment goals will be reviewed regularly to ensure accountability and timely response to areas of concern.

School leadership will review key driver metrics on a **monthly basis**, including interim assessment data, PLC implementation fidelity, intervention effectiveness, credit attainment, and student monitoring systems. These reviews will be conducted by the principal, instructional leadership team, and relevant staff (instructional coaches, counselors, and assistant principals). In addition, **bi-weekly data reviews** will occur at the leadership and team level to monitor short-term progress and adjust support as needed.

The ARCA Board will receive **quarterly updates** on progress toward each priority goal, including both outcome measures and leading indicator data tied to the drivers. These updates will include clear data summaries, trend analysis, and identified areas of strength and concern. The board will engage in discussions with school leadership to ensure that strategies are effectively implemented and aligned to performance targets.

If the school is identified as off track based on interim benchmarks or driver metrics, leadership will take immediate action, including:

- Increasing the frequency of progress monitoring and data reviews
- Providing targeted coaching and professional development for staff
- Adjusting instructional strategies, intervention plans, or resource allocation
- Implementing additional accountability measures for PLCs and instructional practices
- Reallocating staffing or scheduling to prioritize high-need areas

The board will monitor the effectiveness of these adjustments and may require additional reporting or corrective action plans if progress does not improve. This ongoing governance structure ensures that the school remains focused on measurable outcomes, responds proactively to challenges, and maintains accountability for achieving its stated goals.