

Seminole County Public Schools

SANFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 10
 - D. Early Warning Systems 11
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 14
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 15
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 16
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 17
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 18
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 21
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 22
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 31
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 34
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 37
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 38

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on Board Approved 10/07/2025.

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

Our mission is to develop a more widely and diversely populated pipeline of students, with future ready skills, interested in STEM careers in an innovative, safe, and supportive learning environment. Where every student can think critically, and connect and apply STEM principles in order to solve real-world problems, through rigorous and relevant learning experiences across all disciplines.

Provide the school's vision statement

The school where every student is a STEM student and every teacher is a STEM teacher.

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

Dr. Mia Coleman

mia_coleman@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Superintendent's vision for teaching and learning by ensuring that every student achieves academic success and remains safe.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Dr. Berna Munoz

munozbz@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal & Principal Designee

Job Duties and Responsibilities

An instructional leader who coaches teachers, analyzes data, provides feedback, and drives schoolwide improvement by ensuring rigorous, standards-based instruction that supports both teacher growth and student success.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Cindy Brennan

brennacd@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Serves as a key instructional leader in fostering a safe, inclusive, and academically rigorous school environment. This role is focused on promoting student achievement, supporting teacher effectiveness specifically in the English Language Arts (ELA) and Reading departments.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Jennifer Coursin

jennifer_coursin@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assistant Principal and Magnet/MYP Coordinator at Sanford Middle School who leads school operations, supports teachers through instructional and IB-focused professional development, oversees the STEM magnet program and community partnerships, and builds a positive student culture through recognition, family engagement.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Stephanie Lyons

lyonssl1@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Principal's vision for the school by aligning efforts and initiatives with the outlined strategic goals and objectives.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Dr. Ronald Diltz

ronald_diltz@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Dean of Students

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Dean of Students plays a vital leadership role in promoting a safe, respectful, and academically focused school environment. Working closely with the administrative team, teachers, and families, the Dean supports student success through proactive behavior management, restorative practices, and strategic interventions.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Kiafa Moye

kiafa_moye@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Dean of Students

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Dean of Students plays a vital leadership role in promoting a safe, respectful, and academically focused school environment. Working closely with the administrative team, teachers, and families, the Dean supports student success through proactive behavior management, restorative practices, and strategic interventions.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Lori Crumpton

lori_crumpton@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Instructional Literacy Coach supports teachers in strengthening literacy across content areas through coaching, modeling, and collaboration to improve student achievement and promote a culture of literacy schoolwide.

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name

Leonie Campbell

leonie_campbell@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Reading Instructional Lead

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Instructional Coach supports teachers in strengthening literacy across content areas through coaching, modeling, and collaboration to improve student achievement and promote a culture of literacy schoolwide.

Leadership Team Member #10

Employee's Name

Natasha James

jamesnz@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Science Instructional Co-Lead

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Instructional Science Coach collaborates with teachers to strengthen science instruction through modeling, coaching, and the integration of effective strategies that deepen student understanding and build a culture of scientific inquiry across the school.

Leadership Team Member #11

Employee's Name

Kim Coleman

kim_coleman@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Science Instructional Co-Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Curriculum Leader supports the school's vision by guiding teachers, aligning instruction with standards, and promoting rigorous, equitable learning for all students.

Leadership Team Member #12

Employee's Name

Dr. Ashleigh Ramdorsingh

ramdorad@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

ELA Curriculum Leader/NEST Teacher Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Curriculum Leader supports the school's vision by guiding teachers, aligning instruction with standards, and promoting rigorous, equitable learning for all students.

Leadership Team Member #13

Employee's Name

Tisha Futrell

tisha_futrell@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Math Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Instructional Math Coach partners with teachers to enhance math instruction by providing coaching, resources, and collaborative support that drive student success and foster a strong schoolwide culture of mathematics.

Leadership Team Member #14

Employee's Name

Prodipta Das

daspz@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Math Instructional Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Curriculum Leader supports the school’s vision by guiding teachers, aligning instruction with standards, and promoting rigorous, equitable learning for all students.

Leadership Team Member #15

Employee's Name

Courtney Friedman

courtney_friedman@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

STEM/Elective Curriculum Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Curriculum Leader supports the school’s vision by guiding teachers, aligning instruction with standards, and promoting rigorous, equitable learning for all students.

Leadership Team Member #16

Employee's Name

Anna Cazel

anna_cazel@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

STEM/Elective Curriculum Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Curriculum Leader supports the school’s vision by guiding teachers, aligning instruction with standards, and promoting rigorous, equitable learning for all students.

Leadership Team Member #17

Employee's Name

David Salviejo

salviedz@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Social Studies Co-Instructional Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Curriculum Leader supports the school’s vision by guiding teachers, aligning instruction with standards, and promoting rigorous, equitable learning for all students.

Leadership Team Member #18

Employee's Name

Mike Travis

mike_travis@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Social Studies Co-Instructional Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Curriculum Leader supports the school's vision by guiding teachers, aligning instruction with standards, and promoting rigorous, equitable learning for all students.

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.

Sanford Middle School encourages and values ongoing participation from staff, parents, and the community in decisions that impact the school. During the 2024–2025 school year, parents and community members provided feedback on the School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals and strategies. The School Advisory Council (SAC), curriculum leadership team, and other stakeholder groups offered recommendations to help shape the 2025–2026 SIP. Faculty members also participated in several professional development sessions focused on SIP initiatives, where their input was gathered and used to inform progress. Updates on these initiatives were regularly shared with SAC to ensure transparency and collaboration. The finalized SIP will be shared in full on the SCPS district website and highlighted throughout the year in the principal's weekly communications. "BRAVE Connections," the weekly newsletter for parents, and "Warrior Chat," the weekly update for staff, will feature SIP components in a timely, accessible, and audience-appropriate format to keep all stakeholders informed and engaged.

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)).

Sanford Middle has taken a proactive approach by allocating time to thoroughly review the latest performance data. Teachers were asked to analyze this data to identify emerging trends, provide insightful feedback, and propose targeted solutions for improvement, especially in areas where performance is declining or stagnant.

Collaborative teams will work together to determine key data points that require ongoing monitoring and review. These points will be a central focus during staff/teacher weekly meetings, ensuring that instruction stay aligned and responsive to the needs of our students. Teachers will also have the opportunity to share and discuss effective and meaningful strategies during professional development sessions throughout the year, fostering a culture of continuous improvement and professional growth.

The progress we make will be consistently communicated to the School Advisory Council (SAC), which comprises parents, teachers, and community members. This inclusive approach ensures that a diverse range of perspectives is considered, and all input is highly valued. By maintaining this open line of communication, we aim to drive our instructional practices forward, ultimately meeting the diverse needs of all students at Sanford Middle.

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	45.8%
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 <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: A 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment							580	484	400	1,464
Absent 10% or more school days							58	70	41	169
One or more suspensions							21	56	36	113
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							41	63	25	129
Course failure in Math							52	72	59	183
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							63	74	39	176
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							76	52	24	152
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)							15	16	5	36
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)							5	0	0	5

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							76	95	53	224

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							26	45	0	71
Students retained two or more times							11	22	2	35

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							51	71	45	167
One or more suspensions							98	111	123	332
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							18	22	18	58
Course failure in Math							23	22	33	78
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							96	73	58	227
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							87	57	50	194
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							105	98	78	281

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							36	55	16	107
Students retained two or more times							5	2	9	16

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

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

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	72	64	58	62	57	53	59	54	49
Grade 3 ELA Achievement			27			21			
ELA Learning Gains	69	62	59	58	56	56			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55	54	52	54	50	50			
Math Achievement*	80	69	63	75	65	60	69	61	56
Math Learning Gains	74	64	62	72	65	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68	57	57	58	60	60			
Science Achievement	70	62	54	61	56	51	66	56	49
Social Studies Achievement*	84	78	73	74	73	70	71	72	68
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration	90	82	77	84	77	74	83	76	73
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	51	66	53	78	65	49	42	50	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	71%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	713
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
71%	68%	65%	63%	54%		62%

* 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	45%	No		
English Language Learners	62%	No		
Asian Students	87%	No		
Black/African American Students	60%	No		
Hispanic Students	64%	No		
Multiracial Students	76%	No		
White Students	75%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	60%	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 L2.5%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L2.5%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	72%		69%	55%	80%	74%	68%	70%	84%	90%			51%
Students With Disabilities	29%		51%	48%	41%	59%	58%	24%	47%	50%			
English Language Learners	45%		63%	60%	67%	70%	67%	38%	76%	82%			51%
Asian Students	91%		78%	72%	97%	87%	74%	91%	98%	97%			
Black/African American Students	48%		58%	47%	59%	70%	70%	44%	60%	81%			
Hispanic Students	60%		63%	59%	68%	66%	64%	56%	78%	74%			50%
Multiracial Students	72%		75%	75%	77%	70%	73%	75%	94%	73%			
White Students	77%		68%	51%	86%	70%	67%	80%	87%	92%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%		59%	53%	63%	66%	67%	50%	68%	73%			51%

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	62%		58%	54%	75%	72%	58%	61%	74%	84%			78%
Students With Disabilities	20%		43%	45%	34%	54%	45%	19%	26%	38%			60%
English Language Learners	38%		52%	46%	60%	71%	62%	27%	41%	63%			78%
Asian Students	83%		69%	69%	96%	88%	75%	89%	96%	98%			
Black/African American Students	37%		46%	44%	47%	54%	52%	33%	51%	61%			
Hispanic Students	50%		56%	54%	61%	66%	55%	43%	58%	61%			75%
Multiracial Students	57%		49%	50%	77%	74%	85%	67%	75%	90%			
White Students	65%		58%	64%	84%	70%	60%	70%	82%	83%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	41%		48%	49%	57%	60%	54%	38%	55%	65%			75%

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	59%				69%			66%	71%	83%			42%
Students With Disabilities	22%				27%			23%	34%	58%			27%
English Language Learners	30%				43%			30%	41%	70%			39%
Asian Students	86%				93%			89%	94%	97%			
Black/African American Students	32%				42%			35%	49%	56%			
Hispanic Students	42%				54%			52%	50%	71%			41%
Multiracial Students	57%				68%			69%	73%	81%			
White Students	66%				75%			76%	78%	79%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	38%				48%			47%	52%	65%			39%

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

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

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

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	6	71%	66%	5%	60%	11%
ELA	7	71%	63%	8%	57%	14%
ELA	8	70%	62%	8%	55%	15%
Math	6	64%	71%	-7%	60%	4%
Math	7	81%	72%	9%	50%	31%
Math	8	46%	33%	13%	57%	-11%
Science	8	68%	61%	7%	49%	19%
Civics		82%	76%	6%	71%	11%
Biology		92%	71%	21%	71%	21%
Algebra		93%	61%	32%	54%	39%
Geometry		99%	60%	39%	54%	45%
ELA	9	* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
2024-25 WINTER						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
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
Biology		* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.				
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?

The most significant improvement was in ELA Learning Gains, which rose by 11 percentage points to 69%. ELA overall proficiency also increased from 61% in 2024 to 72% in 2025. These gains reflect the collaborative planning of the ELA department. During Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings, teachers aligned instruction to state standards, analyzed student data, and developed targeted interventions to address specific benchmark gaps and grade-level weaknesses.

Notable improvements were also seen in Math Lowest Quartile performance, which increased by 10 points to 68%, and Middle School Acceleration, which rose by 6 points to 90%.

Pre-Algebra Learning Gains showed the highest growth, increasing from 60% to 80%. This was achieved through small class sizes, data-driven small group instruction, use of platforms like IXL for targeted practice, and regular spiral review with formative assessments to guide instruction.

Lowest Performance

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

ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains continue to be an area of focus for Sanford Middle School. In 2024, gains were at 54%, with a slight increase to 55% in 2025. One ongoing challenge has been effectively scaffolding instruction while maintaining the depth and rigor of the standards. For the 2026 school year, our primary focus will be on strengthening support for our Lowest Quartile students through targeted interventions, strategic planning, and data-informed instruction to drive growth.

Sixth grade standard math also presented an opportunity for growth and provided valuable insight into where additional supports can be aligned. Results indicated a need for more deliberate planning, stronger alignment to standards, and targeted focus on foundational skills such as number sense and problem-solving.

In response, we are implementing proactive strategies to improve student outcomes across both content areas. These include enhanced collaborative planning structures, professional development focused on standards-based instruction and classroom engagement, and increased supports to ensure consistent, high-quality teaching and learning experiences. We are confident that with these systems in place, we will see measurable progress in the coming year.

Greatest Decline

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

While Sanford Middle School did not see declines in overall data components, we did observe a widening achievement gap between students in Standard and Advanced ELA classes in grades 7 and 8. In 7th grade, the gap increased from 55% in 2024 to 59% in 2025, and in 8th grade, from 54% to 55%. This highlights the need to ensure high expectations for all students, regardless of course placement, and to provide appropriate scaffolding, interventions, and academic supports for students who are below proficiency. Addressing this gap will be a key priority for ELA in the 2026 school year.

The data component with the greatest year-over-year decline was Geometry learning gains, which decreased from 82% in 2024 to 73% in 2025. This shift was largely due to a concentrated instructional focus on helping students pass the EOC, which, while important, led to fewer opportunities for students to extend beyond basic proficiency levels.

Moving forward, we will balance foundational support with increased rigor, incorporating more challenging, standards-aligned tasks to promote deeper understanding and sustained academic growth for all learners—including those already performing at or above grade level.

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 most significant achievement gaps at Sanford Middle School were observed between standard and advanced-level courses across all core content areas:

- **Math 6:** 63% gap
- **Math 7:** 59% gap
- **8th Grade Science:** 61% gap between subgroups
- **ELA 6:** 48% gap
- **ELA 7:** 59% gap
- **ELA 8:** 55% gap
- **Civics:** 45% gap

These gaps highlight a need to elevate expectations and instructional rigor in standard-level courses across all core subjects. Several contributing factors have been identified, including variability in teacher experience, limited use of formative data to inform instruction, and inconsistent planning aligned to state standards. In some cases, the instructional focus leaned heavily on helping students reach basic proficiency, with fewer opportunities provided for students to engage in rigorous, higher-order tasks that promote deep learning and growth.

Additionally, standard-level courses often featured slower pacing, minimal differentiation, and fewer interventions tailored to students' specific needs. These conditions have made it difficult for some students to close the gap with their advanced-level peers.

To address these disparities, we are implementing a schoolwide focus on strengthening instructional planning, increasing collaboration between standard and advanced-level teachers, and providing targeted professional development in areas such as scaffolding strategies, effective use of formative assessment, and student engagement techniques. These efforts are designed to ensure all students, regardless of course level, have access to challenging, supportive, and high-quality instruction that fosters achievement and growth.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Two potential areas of concern emerge from the data for Sanford Middle School. First, a significant number of students are performing at Level 1 on statewide assessments in both ELA and Math, with 176 students in ELA and 152 in Math scoring at this lowest proficiency level. This issue is particularly pronounced in Grade 6 for Math and Grade 7 for ELA, indicating a need for targeted academic interventions to support these students before gaps widen further. Second, the data show a rising trend in course failures, especially in Math and ELA, with failures peaking in Grade 8. The increasing number of course failures at this stage may signal challenges with academic readiness or insufficient support as students encounter more rigorous content, highlighting the importance of early and ongoing intervention to improve student outcomes.

Highest Priorities

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

1. **Improve Math Proficiency and Reduce Level 1 Scores:** With 152 students scoring Level 1 in Math—especially 76 in Grade 6—math intervention and differentiated instruction should be a primary focus to build foundational skills early.
2. **Reduce Course Failures in Math and ELA:** The high number of course failures, particularly in Grade 8 math (58 students) and ELA across grades, signals a need for academic supports, tutoring, and credit recovery options to keep students on track.
3. **Address Chronic Absenteeism:** Nearly 200 students were absent 10% or more of the school

year, with Grade 7 showing the highest numbers (81 students). Improving attendance will be critical to increasing instructional time and engagement.

4. **Decrease Suspensions and Improve Student Behavior:** With 113 students suspended—most in Grade 7 (56)—behavior interventions, restorative practices, and positive school culture initiatives will help reduce disruptions and keep students in class.
5. **Target Support for Students Scoring Level 1 in ELA:** With 176 students scoring at the lowest proficiency level in ELA, especially in Grades 6 and 7, focused literacy interventions and progress monitoring are essential to improve reading skills and overall academic success.

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction, Collaborative Planning, Differentiation, ELA, Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

Based on a review of last year's proficiency and learning gains data, Sanford Middle School's highest priorities are improving benchmark-aligned instruction, strengthening collaborative planning, and deepening differentiation in both ELA and Math. These priorities were identified due to persistent gaps among SWD, ESOL, and standard-track students, alongside inconsistent growth in the lowest quartile.

In 6th grade ELA, standard students improved in proficiency (31% to 41%), but SWD and ESOL students showed minimal gains, with SWD in ESOL showing no growth. Learning gains and lowest quartile data were modest, indicating a need for stronger scaffolding and language supports. In math, standard proficiency rose slightly (24% to 33%), but learning gains declined (59% to 54%), showing a need for more targeted small-group instruction and remediation.

In 7th grade ELA, while learning gains increased (31% to 58%), proficiency remained low for both standard and ESOL students. In math, growth in the lowest quartile was minimal, and although accelerated students maintained high proficiency, their gains dipped, signaling a need for more consistent rigor and engagement. Collaborative planning should focus on aligning instruction to standards and using student work to guide reteaching.

In 8th grade, ELA showed strong growth in learning gains (25% to 68%) for standard students, but SWD and ESOL gaps remain. Lowest quartile growth also declined. In math, Pre-Algebra showed strong gains (LG: 60% to 80%), while Algebra 1 Standard still needs support in LQ performance. Honors courses slightly declined in gains, pointing to a need for more challenge.

Overall, teachers need support in planning benchmark-aligned lessons, analyzing formative data, and using differentiation strategies daily. Consistent PLC structures and a focus on high-impact

instructional practices will be key to improving outcomes across all subgroups.

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.

Based on the prior year's data, Sanford Middle School has set specific, measurable outcomes for the 2025–2026 school year to address gaps in proficiency, learning gains, and lowest quartile performance. In 6th grade ELA, the goal is to increase standard proficiency from 41% to 50%, ESOL proficiency from 26% to 41%, and SWD proficiency from 29% to 44%. Learning gains are targeted to increase from 58% to 65%, and lowest quartile performance from 60% to 65%. In 6th grade Math, standard proficiency is expected to increase from 33% to 45%, with learning gains rising from 54% to 60% and lowest quartile gains from 62% to 68%. Proficiency in Accelerated and RAMP 6 Math will be maintained above 95%.

In 7th grade ELA, standard proficiency is targeted to grow from 30% to 45%, and ESOL proficiency from 16% to 30%. Learning gains will increase from 58% to 65%, while lowest quartile gains will improve from 64% to 70%. For 7th grade Math, the goal is to raise standard proficiency from 34% to 48%, increase learning gains from 50% to 60%, and raise lowest quartile performance from 48% to 55%. Accelerated Math will maintain a 93%+ proficiency rate, with learning gains increasing from 78% to 85%.

In 8th grade ELA, standard proficiency is projected to grow from 33% to 50%, ESOL from 10% to 25%, learning gains from 68% to 72%, and lowest quartile performance from 71% to 75%. In 8th grade Math, Pre-Algebra proficiency will increase from 46% to 60%, and Algebra 1 Standard lowest quartile performance from 52% to 65%. Geometry Honors learning gains will rise from 73% to 80%, and all honors-level math courses will maintain or exceed 95% proficiency. These targets reflect a data-driven commitment to closing achievement gaps and accelerating growth for all learners.

Monitoring

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

To ensure the Area of Focus is implemented with fidelity and leads to the desired outcomes, Sanford Middle School will monitor both implementation and impact through a multi-tiered system of support, structured collaboration, and data-driven accountability.

Implementation will be monitored through regular administrative walkthroughs, instructional rounds, and Warrior Walks, with a focus on observing benchmark-aligned instruction, evidence of differentiation, and use of standards-based tasks. Feedback will be provided to teachers using a "glows and grows" format, with follow-up support as needed. Additionally, collaborative planning

sessions (PLCs) will be monitored weekly to ensure alignment to priority standards, rigorous task design, and use of formative data to guide instruction. Instructional coaches and curriculum leaders will participate in planning sessions to model strategies, support scaffold design, and ensure that learning tasks are accessible and appropriately challenging for all students, including SWD, ESOL, and LQ populations.

Impact will be tracked using multiple data points. Teachers and PLCs will regularly analyze formative assessments, common progress monitoring results, and quarterly benchmark data to measure progress toward proficiency, learning gains, and lowest quartile targets. Data chats will occur at scheduled checkpoints to review individual student growth and adjust instructional plans accordingly. For students not on track, intervention plans will be developed and monitored through MTSS. Leadership will also use dashboard data to identify trends in subgroup performance and ensure equity across classrooms and content areas.

By combining consistent observation, collaborative planning support, and data-driven instructional adjustments, Sanford Middle School will ensure its Area of Focus is not only implemented consistently, but also results in meaningful student growth and improved outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration, coaches, and teachers will all be responsible for monitoring outcomes.

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:

To support achievement of the measurable outcomes across ELA and Math in all grade levels, Sanford Middle School will implement several evidence-based interventions that focus on improving core instruction, addressing individual student needs, and closing achievement gaps for subgroups such as SWD, ESOL, and students in the lowest quartile. The first intervention is standards-based collaborative planning. Teachers meet weekly in structured PLCs to unpack priority standards, design aligned and rigorous lessons, and create common formative assessments. These sessions focus on ensuring that all students have access to grade-level content through appropriate scaffolds and intentional instructional strategies. This process will be monitored through administrative observation of PLCs, review of submitted plans, and alignment checks during walkthroughs. A second key intervention is the use of differentiated small group instruction in both ELA and Math. Teachers will utilize formative data from exit tickets, standards-aligned checks, and classroom observations to group students flexibly for targeted reteaching or enrichment. These groups will meet regularly and be adjusted based on ongoing data. Implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and instructional rounds, while impact will be measured through student progress on formative and benchmark assessments. To support struggling students, Sanford will also strengthen its use of progress monitoring and intervention through MTSS. Students identified as off-track or within the

lowest quartile will receive targeted interventions in specific skill areas, supported by tools such as i-Ready or teacher-developed resources. Teachers and support staff will track student progress every 2–3 weeks, with adjustments made based on data. Fidelity will be monitored through MTSS documentation, and student outcomes will be reviewed during regular data chats. For ESOL students, the school will implement explicit vocabulary instruction and structured language supports across content areas. These include the use of sentence stems, visual aids, and structured opportunities for speaking and writing. Teachers will receive support in integrating language objectives into daily instruction. Implementation will be monitored through lesson plan checks and classroom observations, and progress will be evaluated through classroom performance and ACCESS testing data. Finally, instructional coaching and modeling will be used to build teacher capacity in implementing high-impact strategies, particularly in differentiation, scaffolding, and formative assessment. Coaches and teacher leaders will provide job-embedded support through co-planning, modeling lessons, and providing feedback. Effectiveness will be tracked through reflection logs, classroom outcomes, and growth in targeted areas identified during walkthroughs. These interventions work together to ensure that students receive the instruction and support they need to meet grade-level expectations, grow academically, and close achievement gaps across all subgroups.

Rationale:

Sanford Middle School’s targeted interventions are grounded in research demonstrating that high-quality core instruction, combined with data-driven differentiation and focused support, leads to improved academic outcomes for all students. Collaborative planning ensures instructional coherence and alignment to standards, which is critical for consistent student access to rigorous content. Differentiated small group instruction addresses individual learning needs, fostering growth through timely reteaching and enrichment. The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework allows for systematic progress monitoring and timely intervention for students who struggle, thereby reducing achievement gaps. Explicit language instruction for ESOL students supports language acquisition alongside content mastery, which is essential for equitable access to curriculum. Instructional coaching builds teacher capacity and promotes sustained implementation of best practices, which enhances instructional quality across classrooms. Collectively, these evidence-based practices create a responsive and inclusive learning environment that supports academic growth and closes achievement gaps for diverse learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

ELA: Interventions and Instructional Support

Person Monitoring:

Brennan

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

The ELA department will implement a collaborative, data-driven approach focused on accelerating growth for our most academically vulnerable students. Key strategies include: Targeted Identification: Utilize assessment data to identify students in the lowest quartile and pinpoint specific skill gaps. Instructional Support: Provide scaffolded, differentiated instruction through small group pull-outs during class time, ensuring students receive personalized support aligned to their individual needs. Collaborative Intervention: ELA teachers will work together to design and deliver high-impact interventions using vetted resources from the district instructional framework and IXL, ensuring consistency and rigor across classrooms. Resources Utilized: * District ELA Framework and Curriculum Guides * IXL Learning Platform for individualized skill reinforcement * Ongoing data analysis from formative and summative assessments

Action Step #2

Math: Targeted Instruction, Coaching, Collaboration, and Differentiation

Person Monitoring:

Munoz

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

To address the challenges in 6th-grade standard math, we will provide targeted mentoring and coaching for new teachers, focusing on effective classroom management and standards-based instruction, led by the instructional coaches, Tisha Futrell, and AP Dr. Berna Munoz. In tandem, structured collaborative planning sessions will be implemented to ensure deliberate alignment to standards and consistent delivery of core content. Additionally, professional development will be offered to support teachers in addressing foundational skill gaps in number sense and problem-solving strategies, with guidance from instructional coaches Lori Crumpton and Tisha Futrell. For geometry, where learning gains have declined most significantly, instruction will shift toward rigorous, standards-aligned tasks that promote higher-order thinking and growth for all students. Formative assessment data will be actively used to differentiate instruction, ensuring that students at or above proficiency continue to grow. This initiative will be led by the geometry teacher, Dr. Causey, and instructional coach Ms. Futrell. To close the achievement gaps between standard and advanced courses, professional development will focus on scaffolding and differentiation strategies to raise expectations in standard-level courses, guided by the instructional coaches. Collaboration between standard and advanced course teachers will be increased to share best practices and ensure alignment of rigor across levels, supported by the department chair, assistant principal, and instructional coaches. Lastly, grade-level teams will strengthen the use of formative assessments in standard-level classes to guide instruction and enhance student engagement.

Action Step #3

Maximize Classroom Instructional Time and Truancy Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Coursin

By When/Frequency:

May 2026

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

Use Minga hall passes to limit unnecessary class absences and flag students at risk of missing instructional time. Teachers, counselors, and administrators review Minga and Skyward reports to identify patterns, provide support, and ensure families are contacted when truancy thresholds are met. Use Minga's positive points system to recognize consistent attendance and positive behaviors, creating a school culture where students want to be present. Establish clear schoolwide expectations for movement and attendance and communicate them to students and families.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

In the 2024-25 school year, 51 sixth graders, 71 seventh graders, and 45 eighth graders were identified as chronically absent. Consistent attendance is especially important in sixth grade as students transition into middle school and build foundational skills. Seventh grade showed the highest number of chronically absent students, which disrupts learning continuity and increases the risk of academic decline. Eighth grade students who miss significant school time face challenges in mastering the skills necessary for high school readiness. Chronic absenteeism reduces instructional time and engagement, leading to lower academic achievement. This focus was identified through a review of prior year attendance data, which revealed a persistent pattern of students missing substantial instructional time, making attendance improvement essential for supporting academic growth and closing achievement gaps.

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.

Student absences negatively impacts student learning by reducing instructional time and engagement, hindering academic progress. To address this, Sanford Middle School aims to reduce chronic absenteeism by 15% for each grade level during the current school year, targeting no more than 43 sixth graders, 60 seventh graders, and 38 eighth graders missing 10% or more of school days. Progress toward these goals will be closely monitored through monthly attendance data to guide timely interventions and support student success.

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.

Sanford Middle School will monitor chronic absenteeism through monthly reviews of attendance data, tracking students missing 10% or more of school days by grade level. This ongoing monitoring will enable timely identification of attendance patterns and support targeted interventions, ultimately improving student engagement and academic outcomes.

Additionally, Sanford will continue to build on its Safe Person initiative to support students' social-emotional needs and attendance. Last school year, students completed the Safe Person survey twice to identify trusted adults on campus. During professional development, staff reviewed survey results, which included students' perceptions of factors important to their success, what they wished teachers knew, and their preferred ways to be recognized. Teachers were informed about the initiative and routinely asked students in crisis to identify their safe adult, using that connection to provide support.

Based on this work, Sanford plans to develop a Safe Person database to help teachers quickly direct students to their identified safe adults, especially when they face difficulties that may affect attendance. The Safe Person campaign will also be used to check in with students struggling with attendance to uncover potential root causes and connect them to caring adults who can intervene. Students without identified safe adults will be introduced to counselors or other trusted staff to build meaningful relationships.

To maintain and strengthen these connections, the Safe Person survey will be administered quarterly moving forward. These regular check-ins will ensure students continue to feel supported and have access to trusted adults, which research shows is critical to reducing absenteeism and improving academic achievement. By combining data-driven attendance monitoring with proactive relationship-building, Sanford Middle School aims to create a supportive environment that promotes consistent attendance and student success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration, coaches, and teachers

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Description of Intervention #1:**Rationale:**

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

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

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.

No Answer Entered

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)).

No Answer Entered

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)).

No Answer Entered

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)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

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

Process to Review the Use of Resources

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

No Answer Entered

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).

No Answer Entered

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