PICOLATA CROSSING ELEMENTARY 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

Picolata Crossing Elementary School will inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

Provide the school's vision statement

All students will be provided an exceptional education that leads to a well-rounded individual who demonstrates critical thinking, leadership, and good character.

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
Brian Morgan

Brian.Morgan@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development

to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name
Ewa Kolk

Ewa.Kolk@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress serving as the Local Education Agent (LEA). In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically utilizing the PLC process. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Shannon Higgins

Shannon.Higgins@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress serving as the Local Education Agent (LEA). In addition, serving as the testing coordinator, Mrs. Higgins works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically utilizing the PLC process. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Cristin Rudi

Cristin.Rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Position Title
Instructional Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The ILC develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with the whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for students considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and is the facilitator of the MTSS team. The ILC plans and provides ongoing, job-embedded professional development to support our instructional staff.

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.

The SIP is shared with stakeholders and input is provided through preplanning to accomplish school goals. The leadership team, school staff, and SAC members are all able to provide feedback and suggestions to be used in the SIP. The school leadership team reflects on the school outcomes and reports at the end of the school year. Teachers and SAC members provide feedback through the SAC survey. Information from stakeholders is incorporated into the development of the SIP by the school principal.

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)).

Critical portions of the SIP are embedded into the PLC process at Picolata Crossing Elementary. This ensures that "what we do" coincides with the purpose of closing achievement gaps. In particular monitoring of student data during every PLC team cycle, to ensure that all students learn at high levels. In addition to this, including ESE and homeroom teachers in the PLC process increases the opportunity for collaboration, monitoring, instructional practices based on data, and keeps the focus on student learning and success.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**ELEMENTARY** **PK-5**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	**NO**
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**22.2%**
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: B** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: A** **2021-22: B** **2020-21: C**

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	135	154	176	161	175	195				996
Absent 10% or more school days	35	33	38	27	30	51				214
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	3	3	2				11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	2	1	2	0	0				6
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	2	0	0				6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	20	41	26	12	25	25				149
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	16	17	21	12	15	24				105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	1	6	2	2						11
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	1	2	4	6	6					19

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	20	41	26	12	25	25				149

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	2	1	2						6
Students retained two or more times										0

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

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	28	27	22	16	25	35				153
One or more suspensions	5	2	2	2	2	2				15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				2	2	3				7
Course failure in Math				2	2	3				7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				12	26	2				40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				8	19	2				29
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	5	2	2	8	19	3				39

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		1						3
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*	67	74	59	70	73	57	66	70	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	71	76	59	72	76	58	73	73	53
ELA Learning Gains	57	64	60	63	66	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42	53	56	43	53	57			
Math Achievement*	68	77	64	75	76	62	72	73	59
Math Learning Gains	58	69	63	62	67	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41	57	51	49	53	52			
Science Achievement	69	73	58	73	69	57	66	69	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	85	67	63	64	64	61	73	66	59

*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	62%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	558
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
62%	63%	70%	60%	51%		72%

* 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	43%	No		
English Language Learners	65%	No		
Asian Students	56%	No		
Black/African American Students	60%	No		
Hispanic Students	64%	No		
Multiracial Students	65%	No		
White Students	58%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	53%	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	67%	71%	57%	42%	68%	58%	41%	69%					85%
Students With Disabilities	42%	44%	49%	38%	43%	45%	28%	51%					
English Language Learners	50%		47%		73%	71%							85%
Asian Students	67%		46%		72%	38%							
Black/African American Students	67%		50%		73%	50%							
Hispanic Students	66%	71%	62%	50%	66%	68%	67%	59%					
Multiracial Students	62%	56%	59%		70%	59%		86%					
White Students	68%	72%	57%	38%	68%	57%	37%	70%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%	45%	62%	52%	53%	59%	46%	54%					

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	70%	72%	63%	43%	75%	62%	49%	73%					64%
English Language Learners	73%		77%		80%	62%					64%		
Students With Disabilities	39%	46%	45%	31%	55%	48%	38%	50%					
Asian Students	57%				79%								
Black/African American Students	67%		71%		78%	79%							
Hispanic Students	78%	86%	68%		83%	70%	70%	73%					
Multiracial Students	78%	80%	70%		83%	85%							
White Students	67%	67%	60%	38%	72%	57%	45%	72%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	60%	55%	63%	39%	69%	55%	29%	69%					

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	66%	75%			72%			66%					73%
Students With Disabilities	36%	60%			46%			15%					
English Language Learners	77%				69%								
Black/African American Students	59%				55%								
Hispanic Students	73%	82%			79%			70%					
Multiracial Students	64%	67%			68%								
White Students	66%	76%			71%			65%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	67%			64%			55%					

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	3	69%	77%	-8%	57%	12%
ELA	4	64%	75%	-11%	56%	8%
ELA	5	66%	73%	-7%	56%	10%
Math	3	73%	79%	-6%	63%	10%
Math	4	70%	79%	-9%	62%	8%
Math	5	63%	74%	-11%	57%	6%
Science	5	69%	71%	-2%	55%	14%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Most Improvement

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

Students with disabilities ESSA subgroup continues to improve and all ESSA subgroups are above the required 41%. The actions taken included additional monitoring during PLC and planning for next steps based on data through progress monitoring and teacher collaboration.

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 achievement showed the lowest performance with a 67% proficiency overall. The trend for achievement was up and down over the last three years.
2022-23, ELA 66% & MATH 72%
2023-24, ELA 70% & MATH 75%
2024-25, ELA 67% & MATH 68%

Greatest Decline

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

Math lowest quartile had the greatest decline from the prior year.
2023-2024, MATH LQ 49%
2024-2025, MATH LQ 41%

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.

When compared to the state the greatest gap was MATH LQ. The state was 56%, the district was 53% and the school was 42%. The lowest quartile students need additional intervention.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Continued monitoring of ESE students to ensure they remain above the 41%.

Highest Priorities

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

The highest priorities include increasing the following areas by at least 3 percentage points each:
MATH achievement, ELA achievement, MATH learning gains, & ELA learning gains.

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 Professional Learning Communities

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.

The areas of focus include MATH achievement, ELA achievement, MATH learning gains, and ELA learning gains. Each grade level will focus on the math and reading common assessments to identify the gaps in essential standards and intervene through PLC data review and planning for instruction through WIN "What I Need" time.

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.

To increase the following measurable outcomes:

MATH achievement from 68 to 71

ELA achievement from 67 to 70

MATH learning gains from 58 to 61

ELA learning gains from 57 to 60

Monitoring

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

Progress monitoring with common assessment based on standards and the PM data from reporting periods 1 and 2, during PLC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Brian Morgan, Principal

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:

Grade 3 intervention block, small group tier I intervention, WIN grade level small group intervention with Fundations phonics intervention- monitored through common assessment data and progress monitoring CORE Phonics identification, fluency assessment. Grade 4 intervention block, small group tier I intervention, WIN grade level small group intervention- monitored through common assessment data and progress monitoring, CORE Phonics identification, fluency assessment. Grade 5 small group tier I intervention, WIN grade level small group intervention- monitored through common assessment data and progress monitoring.

Rationale:

Intervention of benchmarks and essential standards in between progress monitoring will fill academic gaps, specific identification of reading deficiencies such as phonics and the use of a research-based intervention will increase reading achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

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

Action Step #1

An additional intervention block was added for Grades K-4.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Brian Morgan	According to the master schedule/Weekly

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

The intervention blocks should be used with fidelity to address student needs.

Action Step #2

Tier II and Tier III intervention during WIN "What I Need" timeframe

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Brian Morgan	According to the master schedule/Weekly

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

The WIN block should be used with fidelity to address student needs. District support staff from curriculum and planning and accountability, who have successfully supported schools with similar areas of growth, will attend PLC grade level meetings to support data analysis, student grouping, identification of resources, and instructional strategies. Through the PLC process grade levels will assign students to the teacher who had the highest scores based on the area of need (specific standard identified in the common assessments).

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.

Through the PLC process teachers will work together to assist students with academic success. Teachers will find value in their career choice when they see the positive impact results.

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.

The goal is to have an average higher than the district and state average for teacher retention by at least 3%.

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.

A retention of teachers will result with an increase in a return on investment from school based professional learning and a team of teachers with PLC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Brian Morgan

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 increase employee retention at Picolata Crossing by implementing evidence-based interventions that prioritize teacher well-being and professional growth. These include offering relevant, teacher-inspired professional learning that aligns with classroom realities, reducing nonessential meetings to protect planning time, and setting reasonable expectations for time off while modeling this balance as leaders. Promoting team collaboration through fun, morale boosting activities fosters a sense of community, while establishing a teacher-led problem-solving team empowers staff voice and shared decision-making. Providing consistent positive feedback to all staff and reviewing teacher data to celebrate successes in PLCs reinforces a culture of appreciation and growth.

Rationale:
The rationale behind these strategies is rooted in research showing that when educators feel valued, supported, and involved in shaping their work environment, they are more likely to remain committed to their school community, leading to improved student outcomes and a more stable, positive school climate.

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
Professional Learning and time to work through a lesson study style collaboration with planning and debrief opportunities: K-2 phonics professional learning and 3-5 writing professional learning.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Brian Morgan	October-May

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Teachers will engage in collaborative planning, observation, and debrief sessions focused on high-impact instructional strategies. Each cycle will include: Initial Professional Learning Session: Focused on evidence-based practices in phonics (K–2) and writing (3–5). Collaborative Planning Time: Grade-level teams will co-plan a lesson incorporating the learned strategies. Lesson Implementation & Observation: One teacher will teach the planned lesson while peers observe using a focused observation tool. Debrief & Reflection Session: Teams will analyze student engagement and learning outcomes, and refine instructional approaches.

Action Step #2
Professional Learning and time to work through a lesson study style collaboration with planning and debrief opportunities: K-2 phonics professional learning and 3-5 writing professional learning.

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Cristin Rudi	October - May

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Debrief & Reflection Session: Teams will analyze student engagement and learning outcomes, and refine instructional approaches. Teacher implementation: The instructional literacy coach will gauge shifts in teacher confidence and understanding of phonics and writing instruction.

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 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.

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