ALICE B. LANDRUM MIDDLE SCHOOL

2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

The Department's SIP template meets:

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Alice B. Landrum Middle School is to prepare students for high school by developing the learners' critical thinking capacity, strengthening the literacy skills of all learners, encouraging student agency, and providing opportunities for students to build healthy interpersonal character.

Provide the school's vision statement

Landrum Middle School will forever honor its rich academic traditions and history of student achievement, as we set a course for the future success of all students.

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

Troy Kasting

troy.kasting@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To provide stewardship, leadership, and vision for the overall growth, academic achievement and success of all learners.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Jarred Shaw

Jarred.shaw@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Instructional Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Kelly Gibian

kelly.gibian@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Allison Tumbelty

Allison.Tumblety@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name
P.J. Grall

patrick.grall@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Dean of Students

Job Duties and Responsibilities

To provide support to and for the schools' mission and vision.

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.

Landrum Middle School engages its SAC and PTO on a monthly basis to collaborate on ideas and opportunities to improve outcomes for the learning community. Our monthly agendas will reflect the school's priorities and our plans for ongoing improvement. Monthly faculty/departmental meetings provide an opportunity to share and engage with instructional stakeholders and support staff on those priorities and ideas developed with community stakeholders. Our leadership team provides a platform to the student council to ensure that the student leadership organization's values are reflected within the leadership priorities.

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)).

Our leadership team will facilitate an ESSA data discussion with members of the SAC, PTO, and Student Council in the beginning of the school year on September 12th, to increase awareness of the opportunities presented within our school data analysis. Our goal is to increase transparency as well as provide a rationale for our academic/ learning areas of focus throughout the school year. Monthly updates throughout the school year will be provided regarding our processes implemented to ensure success for all students, particularly those identified as ESSA subgroups. Our team will encourage and support the instructional staff's efforts to maintain expertise in content and pedagogy as our primary tool to reduce learning gaps and increase teacher efficacy. In particular this year, our staff will work in PLCs to develop unit plans collectively to tie curriculum standards to statewide assessments. Collectively our school community will work deliberately to promote a school culture and environment that all students feel a sense of belonging, while we work to foster agency among all learners. A focus will be on improvement on classroom management strategies due to a high number of new and younger teachers.

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	**5.1%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**NO**
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	**N/A**
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)** **ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)** **ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN)** **BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)** **HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)** **MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)** **WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)** **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)**
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY *2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.*	**2024-25: A** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: A** **2021-22: A** **2020-21: A**

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	261	298	359	918
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	45	85	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	35	85	144
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	3	18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	2	17
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	0	0	0	0	0				0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	0	0	0				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							0	0	0	0

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							1	0	1	2
Students retained two or more times							0	0	0	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							60	45	85	190
One or more suspensions							25	34	35	94
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							4	4	5	13
Course failure in Math							4	4	5	13
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							16	12	9	37

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									1	1
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 CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	86	74	58	83	72	53	80	71	49
Grade 3 ELA Achievement			27			21			
ELA Learning Gains	71	66	59	68	62	56	68	73	56
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64	55	52	64	54	50			
Math Achievement*	90	80	63	92	81	60	91	79	56
Math Learning Gains	75	72	62	77	73	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69	63	57	81	65	60			
Science Achievement	83	76	54	83	75	51	79	73	49
Social Studies Achievement*	98	93	73	95	93	70	94	87	68
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration	82	73	77	79	73	74	71	68	73
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	57	57	53	65	65	49	79	49	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)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	80%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	718
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
80%	80%	83%	72%	74%		78%

* 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	59%	No		
English Language Learners	72%	No		
Asian Students	83%	No		
Black/African American Students	81%	No		
Hispanic Students	75%	No		
Multiracial Students	76%	No		
White Students	80%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	76%	No		

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

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	86%		71%	64%	90%	75%	69%	83%	98%	82%			
Students With Disabilities	61%		63%	60%	58%	57%	48%	53%	89%	44%			
English Language Learners			55%			82%	80%						
Asian Students	87%		71%	55%	94%	87%	80%	81%	96%	94%			
Black/African American Students	90%		76%		86%	71%							
Hispanic Students	81%		73%	65%	83%	70%	71%	72%	100%	61%			
Multiracial Students	82%		60%	50%	86%	78%	53%	77%	100%	95%			
White Students	87%		71%	65%	91%	74%	69%	87%	98%	82%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	74%		63%	56%	85%	71%	74%	67%	100%	90%			

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	83%		68%	64%	92%	77%	81%	83%	95%	79%			
Students With Disabilities	46%		54%	54%	67%	70%	72%	46%	77%	32%			
Asian Students	90%		83%		99%	86%		100%	100%	86%			
Black/African American Students	68%		64%	55%	77%	73%	67%						
Hispanic Students	80%		63%	62%	90%	82%	79%	82%	88%	77%			
Multiracial Students	79%		83%	71%	81%	69%	50%	75%	100%	76%			
White Students	84%		67%	65%	93%	77%	84%	83%	96%	79%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	65%		58%	61%	83%	72%	75%	85%	92%	73%			

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	80%				91%			79%	94%	71%			79%
Students With Disabilities	40%				67%			31%		48%			
English Language Learners	64%				93%								
Asian Students	90%				95%			92%		84%			
Black/African American Students	62%				73%			67%					
Hispanic Students	75%				82%			71%		59%			
Multiracial Students	81%				80%			79%		81%			
White Students	80%				93%			80%	95%	70%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	73%				78%			71%					

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.

SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
2024-25 SPRING						
ELA	6	90%	76%	14%	60%	30%
ELA	7	85%	74%	11%	57%	28%
ELA	8	83%	75%	8%	55%	28%
Math	6	89%	81%	8%	60%	29%
Math	7	64%	63%	1%	50%	14%
Math	8	88%	83%	5%	57%	31%
Science	8	82%	75%	7%	49%	33%
Civics		97%	93%	4%	71%	26%
Algebra		100%	78%	22%	54%	46%
Geometry		98%	74%	24%	54%	44%
ELA	9	*data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.*				
Biology		*data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.*				
2024-25 FALL						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Algebra		*data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.*				
Geometry		*data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.*				

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Most Improvement

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

Overall our ELA PM 3 FAST achievement scores for all grade levels (6-8) were at an 86% proficiency, up 3% from the previous year and a 6% growth from the 2022-2023 year prior. Our subgroup of students with disabilities in ELA overall percentages for all grades rose from 6% to 9% with achievement scores of a Level 3 or better. Sixth grade ELA scores for PM 3 for a Level 3 or above were a 90%. Algebra EOC scores had 100% proficiency. Geometry EOC scores had 98% proficiency. Math PM 3 FAST achievement scores for all grade levels (6-8) were at an 90% proficiency, down from 92% overall, but still above the state and district averages. New actions were taken in this area were teacher coaching support from the ILC. Training with the Assistant Principal on best practices for documenting accommodations and supporting students with education plans. Teacher professional development and PLCs in areas of need were also beneficial to this improvement.

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 math achievement level was 90%. Algebra and Geometry EOC achievement were 100% and 98% respectively. However the subgroup of SWD dropped from 67% in 2023-2024 to 58% in 2024-2025. Seventh grade PM3 FAST scores dropped to a 64% in 2024-2025 from an 82% in 2023-2024. The bottom quartile decreased from 81% to 69% in achievement. Due to replacing an 8th grade teacher in the first quarter and finding a permanent replacement not until the end of that first quarter, there was a transition period that required adjustment in the learning process. One 7th grade math teacher took on added 8th grade Pre-Algebra class and took on a full schedule.

Greatest Decline

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

The greatest decline from the prior year were the 7th grade FAST PM 3 achievement scores from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025. It declined from 82% to 64% achievement level, a 18% decrease. The SWD subgroup in overall grades 6-8 also declined from 67% to 58%, a 9% decrease.

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 greatest gap in a positive trend from LMS to the state average are our combined grades (6-8) math FAST PM 3 scores, which is 34% in favor of Landrum Middle School. A big contributing factor is increased planning time in PLCs where teachers shared best practices, planned units and common assessments together. All of our state test data outperformed the state averages. Again, our grade 7 math FAST PM3 scores narrowly outperformed the state average by 4%. As per reasons stated above in staffing may have contributed to this trend.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Students with disabilities subgroup in ELA 7th grade had a 56% achievement success rate, while 44% of those same subgroup did not reach achievement cut scores in their FAST PM3. 6th and 8th grade both had a 64% achievement success rate in SWD subgroups, while both grades had a 36% that did not reach achievement cut scores in their FAST PM3.

SWD in 7th grade Math had a 53% success achievement rate, while 47% did not reach achievement cut scores in their FAST PM3.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Increase student achievement in ELA and Math by 2% points in our students with disabilities subgroup.
2. Increase student achievement in ELA and Math by 2% point in Lower 25% bottom quartile students subgroup.
3. Increase teacher retention by strengthening relationships and fostering positive collaboration amongst staff with the goal of increasing student achievement through professional development in effective classroom management practices and coaching styles.
4. Strengthen instructional practices by improving areas in creating curriculum unit plans and developing common assessments for all classes through the process of collaborative PLCs.

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

ELA Fast PM3 scores for all students had a 86% achievement level in all grade levels. ESSA subroups in ELA scored 61% in all grade levels, which was still higher than the district.

Math FAST PM3 for all students had a 90% achievement level across all grade levels. 3% of SWD in all grade levels did not achieve proficiency level for the Math FAST PM3. Conversely 9% of SWD in all grade levels achieved proficiency in Math FAST PM3.

There is room for improvement to address the learning gaps by meeting the needs of these students through differentiated instruction practices that are outlined in their Individual Education Plans.

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.

Students with disabilities will continue to improve in ELA, Math and Science achievement scores. ELA scores in students with disabilities from 46% to 60% in 2024 to 2025. ELA learning gains in the bottom 25% quartile by 64% in that same year frame. Math learning gains in the bottom 25% quartile improved by 69% in that same year time frame. Science achievement improved in the subgroup of students with disabilties from 46% to 53% in 2024 to 2025. Increased professional development in the form of one on one coaching cycles and PLC planning.

Monitoring

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

Targeted instruction with the subgroups of students with disabilties and bottom quartile by monitoring achievement in formative assessment tied to the state standards, Analyzing data in PLCs in FAST PM 1 and PM 2 assessments in PLC teams to identify learning gaps in not only students with

disabilties, bottom quartile students, but all students. The MTSS team will help track low performing students with added supports to assist teachers and students alike. PLC teams will continue to create and revise unit plans that use backwards design planning that are tied to state standards assessed in common summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Troy Kasting

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:
Teacher coaching and support with ILC based on needs.

Rationale:
"A 2018 meta-analysis of 60 causal studies found that the difference in effectiveness between teachers with instructional coaches and those without was equivalent to the difference between novice teachers and teachers with five to ten years of experience" (Annenberg Ed Research For Recovery 2022). "Professional learning communities (PLCs) have been acknowledged as highly effective, with their characteristics being identified with reasonable consistency" (IES REL Impact of PLCs 2019).

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
Teacher coaching and support with ILC based on needs.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Jarred Shaw	Weekly and monthly depending on the needs of each teacher.

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Meet the needs of new teachers in classroom management, planning instruction, curriculum planning of unit plans, creating common assessments, and instructional strategies. Coaching cycles can be met in various ways to plan, co-teach, model, observe, collect data and analyze it, and then debrief. It is an ongoing process that roots in a problem of practice that the teacher agrees that they want to grow and work on throughout the year.

Action Step #2
PLC Planning Time TDE Unit Planning and Common Assessments

Person Monitoring:
Troy Kasting / Jarred Shaw

By When/Frequency:
Monthly PLC time and literacy walkthroughs and observations

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
PLC teams were created. Teachers will be trained in unit planning and begin creating living document in the backwards design planning of Wiggins and McTeague model to improve their instructional strategies that tie to state standards and prepare all students for proficiency in assessments. In PLC teams, teachers will create common assessments to use in each unit. Teachers will discuss their data tied to the standards. Teachers will determine best practices for instruction, re-teaching, remediation, differentiation, and enrichment based on data driven discussions.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Strengthening relationships and fostering collaboration amongst staff with the goal of increasing students' achievement for all students. Focus on retention of new teachers so they feel supported with the beginnnings of a new teaching profession, especially classroom management.

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.

Provide professional development opportunities and resources for teachers to gain and maintain expertise in classroom management, positive behavioral incentive systems, as well as expertise in content and pedagogy.

Provide one on one coaching cycles with ILC and mentor groups (new teacher cadre) in areas of classroom management so teachers are supported with classroom management, curriculum, and school-wide issues.

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.

One on one coaching cycles will be documented by ILC through collaborative planning, observation,

and debriefing notes.
Professional development workshops documented with survey results as to the effectiveness of the workshop.
Multiple whole staff luncheons / staff outings to increase collaborations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Troy Kasting

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

Description of Intervention #1:
Professional development will include PLC time, TDE time, district workshops.

Rationale:
Spending time with your colleagues that is mission driven to achieve student success is beneficial for school success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

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

Action Step #1
Principal spotlight on a teacher, staff outings at the end of each semester will improve positive culture amongst staff.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Troy Kasting	Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Multiple whole staff luncheons / staff outings to increase collaborations.

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.

N/A

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)).

N/A

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)).

N/A

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)).

N/A

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)).

N/A

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)).

N/A

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)).

N/A

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)).

N/A

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 ATSIor 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.

N/A

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).

N/A

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