Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Schoolwide Program Plan

The Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program Plan template was designed to ensure each school site plan is fully developed according to the requirements in ESEA Section 1114. The Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program Plan must be reviewed and submitted annually to the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) as a part of the Consolidated Application.

1. In the space below, enter the school year (Example 2024-2025) the plan will be implemented.

2025-2026

2. In the space below, enter the date (month, date, year) the plan was last reviewed. The date should be within the current calendar year.

September 11, 2025

3. In the table below, enter the requested information for the district.

District Information	
District Name:	Choctaw-Nicoma Park School District
District Number:	I-004
County Name:	Oklahoma
County Number:	55
Superintendent Name:	David Reid
Email Address:	dreid@cnpschools.org

4. In the table below, enter the requested information for the school site.

School Information	
School Name:	Nicoma Park Middle School
School Site Code:	515
Principal Name:	Jacob Freer
Email Address:	jfreer@cnpschools.org
*School Poverty Rate:	46.46%

*Required for the school to report. Please consult with district personnel regarding the rate reported in the Consolidated Application (Grants Management System).

Instructions

The template is composed of five sections. Each section has three parts.

- The first part outlines the relevant passages in ESEA and contains a check box where the school principal will certify that the legal requirements have been met.
- The second part describes the expectations for the narratives.
- The third part is a text box where the narrative responses are to be entered. There is no word or character limit, and the text box will expand.

1. Parent and Community Stakeholder Involvement
✅ By checking this box, the school principal certifies that: ● the plan is developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and, if appropriate, specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. ESEA Section 1114(b)(2) ● The plan is available to the local educational agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. ESEA Section 1114(b)(4) ● The school meets the requirements of Section 1116 of ESEA, including the development and implementation of a parent and family engagement policy that includes a school-parent compact outlining shared responsibility for high student academic achievement. ESEA Section 1116 (b-g)
Expectations
1. Specific strategies to increase family and community stakeholder involvement, particularly among those who represent the most at-risk students, based upon results of the needs assessment, have been identified and implemented. 2. Parents and community stakeholders who reflect the demographic composition of the school, including those who represent the most at-risk students, are included as decision makers in a broad spectrum of school decisions, including the development and monitoring of the Title I schoolwide plan. 3. The school vision and mission for student success are collaboratively developed based on the beliefs and values of the school community, including families and community stakeholders who represent the most at-risk students. 4. The Title I schoolwide plan, as well as all communication regarding its development, evaluation, and revision processes, are available in languages and formats accessible for every family and community stakeholder of the school.
Addressing the above expectations, describe in the box below the strategies to increase family and community stakeholder involvement.
1. Strategies ● Host “student showcase nights” where students present projects, performances, or service activities to encourage family pride and involvement. ● Record workshops and make them available online. ● Empower student leadership groups (NJHS, Student Council) to plan and lead family events.

2. Collaboration & Community Partnerships

- Partner with churches, libraries, and nonprofits to bring community support into the school.
- Invite business and community leaders to mentor students and participate in career days.
- Train staff in trauma-informed and culturally responsive practices.

Parents and community stakeholders, including those representing at-risk students, are included in:

- The development, review, and revision of the Title I Schoolwide Plan.
- Site-based decision-making committees.
- Data review sessions and school improvement planning.

3. Vision and Mission

- The school vision and mission for student success are collaboratively developed and regularly revisited based on the beliefs and values of the school community. Families, staff, and community stakeholders — particularly those representing at-risk students — are active participants in shaping and sustaining this vision.

4. Accessibility and Communication

- Nicoma Park Middle School ensures that the Title I Schoolwide Plan and all related communication regarding its development, evaluation, and revision processes are available in languages and formats accessible to every family and community stakeholder. This includes translated documents, interpreter services, and alternative formats for individuals with disabilities.

2. Comprehensive Needs Assessment

✅ By checking this box, the school principal certifies that the schoolwide plan was developed based on a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that took into account information on the academic achievement of children in relation to the challenging state academic standards, particularly the needs of those children who were failing, or were at-risk of failing, to meet the challenging state academic standards and any other factors as determined by the local educational agency. ESEA Section 1114(b)(6)

Expectations

1. Includes a variety of data, including performance (e.g., local and state student assessment data) and non-performance student data (e.g., student attendance), and process data about the schools system (e.g., diagnostic review) and perception data, gathered from several sources.
2. Includes detailed analysis of performance and non-performance data for each student subgroup identified in 1111(c)(2) of ESEA (economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners).
3. Examines student, teacher, school and community strengths and needs.

4. School leadership, in collaboration with families and community stakeholders, identifies a manageable number of priorities, at the right level of magnitude and aligned with the needs assessment, for school improvement.
5. Evidence shows that the school's Title I schoolwide plan and cycle of continuous improvement has improved outcomes for all students, particularly those most at-risk.

Addressing the above expectations, describe the outcomes of the school's comprehensive needs assessment, as well as a description of the data sources used in the process. The results should include detailed analysis of all student subgroups; an examination of student, teacher, school and community strengths and needs; and a summary of priorities that will be addressed in the schoolwide program.

According to the STAR Longitudinal Reading Report:

6th Grade STAR Reading

- 2023–2024
  - Below 10 PR: 8%
  - 10–24 PR: 8%
  - 25–39 PR: 11%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 73%
  - Takeaway: Nearly 3 out of 4 students are reading at or above average.
- 2024–2025
  - Below 10 PR: 8%
  - 10–24 PR: 8%
  - 25–39 PR: 13%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 71%
  - Takeaway: Small dip (-2%) in students at/above 40 PR, with more clustering in the 25–39 range.
- Fall 2025–2026
  - Below 10 PR: 8%
  - 10–24 PR: 12%
  - 25–39 PR: 7%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 74%
  - Takeaway: Positive rebound—more students moved into the 40+ range, though a bump in students at the 10–24 PR band suggests a small struggling group is growing.

✅ Overall Trend (6th grade): Stability with slight improvement; roughly 70–74% consistently at or above average. Main area of concern is the 10–24 PR group growing slightly.

7th Grade STAR Reading

- 2023–2024
  - Below 10 PR: 9%
  - 10–24 PR: 9%
  - 25–39 PR: 18%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 64%

- Takeaway: Only about 2 in 3 at/above average; a large chunk in the 25–39 PR band.

- 2024–2025
  - Below 10 PR: 7%
  - 10–24 PR: 6%
  - 25–39 PR: 7%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 80%
  - Takeaway: Major growth—huge shift upward (16% increase). Intervention success or a stronger instructional year.
- Fall 2025–2026
  - Below 10 PR: 7%
  - 10–24 PR: 9%
  - 25–39 PR: 12%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 72%
  - Takeaway: Slight decline from last year's peak, but still stronger than two years ago.

✅ Overall Trend (7th grade): Big improvement from 64% to around 72–80%. Middle group (25–39 PR) continues to be the key growth area.

8th Grade STAR Reading

- 2023–2024
  - Below 10 PR: 10%
  - 10–24 PR: 16%
  - 25–39 PR: 16%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 58%
  - Takeaway: Just over half on grade level or above—the largest struggling group compared to other grades.
- 2024–2025
  - Below 10 PR: 8%
  - 10–24 PR: 11%
  - 25–39 PR: 16%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 65%
  - Takeaway: Strong improvement (+7%)—fewer in the lowest bands.
- Fall 2025–2026
  - Below 10 PR: 6%
  - 10–24 PR: 10%
  - 25–39 PR: 14%
  - At/Above 40 PR: 70%
  - Takeaway: Continued growth—up 12 points over two years. Struggling readers are shrinking.

✅ Overall Trend (8th grade): Most impressive long-term growth (from 58% → 70%). The lowest-performing group is shrinking steadily.

Schoolwide Summary (6–8)

- Strengths
  - All grades show a consistent upward trend in students at/above 40 PR.
  - Lowest-performing groups (<10 PR) are shrinking over time (8–10% range).
  - Instructional or intervention supports appear effective, especially in grades 7 & 8.
- Areas to Monitor
  - The 10–24 PR group is not shrinking in 6th grade—it actually grew slightly. This group is at risk of sliding down without support.
  - The 7th-grade dip in Fall 2025–26 suggests a need to ensure gains hold across summer/transition.
  - Although improving, 8th grade still has the lowest proportion at/above 40 PR compared to 6th and 7th.

Breakdown and summary of Nicoma Park Middle School's **2023–2024 OSTP scores**:

6th Grade
Reading
- 46% of students scored Below Basic or Basic.
- 54% scored Proficient or Advanced.
  ➡️ Over half are meeting grade-level expectations, but nearly half still need significant reading support.

Math
- 47% Below Basic or Basic.
- 53% Proficient or Advanced.
  ➡️ Math performance is similar to reading, with just over half meeting or exceeding standards.

7th Grade
Reading
- 42% Below Basic or Basic.
- 58% Proficient or Advanced.
  ➡️ Reading improves slightly in 7th grade, with the majority on track.

Math
- 55% Below Basic or Basic.
- 45% Proficient or Advanced.
  ➡️ Math lags behind reading; more than half of students struggle to meet grade-level expectations.

8th Grade
Reading
- 51% Below Basic or Basic.
- 49% Proficient or Advanced.
  ➡️ Reading declines compared to 6th and 7th, with just under half meeting expectations.

Math
- 64% Below Basic or Basic.

- 36% Proficient or Advanced.

➡️ Math is the most challenging subject—nearly two-thirds of students are below grade level.

Science

- 46% Below Basic or Basic.
- 54% Proficient or Advanced.

➡️ Science outcomes are stronger than 8th-grade math, with more than half on track, but nearly half still struggling.

Nicoma Park Middle School's 2023–2024 OSTP results show that reading achievement is relatively stronger than math across all grades, with 7th-grade reading being the highest-performing area. However, math scores decline sharply in 7th and 8th grades, indicating a critical need for targeted math interventions. Science in 8th grade shows potential, but nearly half of the students are still performing below proficiency.

6th Grade (Economically Disadvantaged)

Reading

- 60% Below Basic/Basic
- 40% Proficient/Advanced

➡️ More than half struggle with reading; only 1% at Advanced.

Math

- 65% Below Basic/Basic
- 35% Proficient/Advanced

➡️ Math performance is weaker than reading, with nearly 4 in 10 at the lowest level.

7th Grade (Economically Disadvantaged)

Reading

- 55% Below Basic/Basic
- 41% Proficient/Advanced

➡️ Slightly stronger than 6th grade, but still more than half not meeting expectations.

Math

- 73% Below Basic/Basic
- 26% Proficient/Advanced

➡️ Math is a major concern—over 1 in 2 are Below Basic, and fewer than 1 in 4 are Proficient or Advanced.

8th Grade (Economically Disadvantaged)

Reading

- 60% Below Basic/Basic
- 41% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Reading outcomes are consistent with earlier grades, but a majority still below proficiency.

Math

- 83% Below Basic/Basic
- 16% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Math achievement drops sharply in 8th grade—two-thirds Below Basic, only 3% Advanced.

Overall Trends & Key Takeaways

- Reading: Around 40% of economically disadvantaged students reach Proficient/Advanced across all grades. However, 55–60% remain Below Basic/Basic, with very few at Advanced (1–3%).
- Math: A significant concern. Proficiency steadily decreases by grade:
  - 6th grade → 35% Proficient/Advanced
  - 7th grade → 26% Proficient/Advanced
  - 8th grade → 16% Proficient/Advanced
    ➡️ Achievement gaps widen in math as students move up grade levels.
- Comparison to Overall School: Economically disadvantaged students perform 10–20 percentage points lower in both reading and math compared to the overall population.

6th Grade (Racial & Ethnic Subgroup)

Reading

- 72% Below Basic/Basic
- 28% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Only about 1 in 4 students are meeting reading expectations; no students scored Advanced.

Math

- 72% Below Basic/Basic
- 28% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Math mirrors reading—most students are performing well below grade level.

7th Grade (Racial & Ethnic Subgroup)

Reading

- 92% Below Basic/Basic

- 8% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Reading drops drastically—fewer than 1 in 10 are at grade level, and none Advanced.

Math

- 92% Below Basic/Basic
- 8% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Math shows the same severe decline—majority of students are Below Basic.

8th Grade (Racial & Ethnic Subgroup)

Reading

- 92% Below Basic/Basic
- 9% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Slight improvement from 7th, but still over 9 in 10 students are not proficient.

Math

- 92% Below Basic/Basic
- 9% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Math remains extremely low-performing; none Advanced.

Overall Trends & Key Takeaways

- Very Low Achievement: Across all grades, this subgroup has the lowest performance of all groups at Nicoma Park Middle School.
- Reading: Starts weak in 6th grade (28% Proficient), then drops sharply in 7th (8%), with a slight rebound in 8th (9%). Advanced performance is 0% in every grade.
- Math: Follows the same pattern—28% Proficient in 6th, dropping to single digits (8–9%) by 7th and 8th grade. No Advanced scores.
- Achievement Gap: Compared to the overall school population (roughly 50–55% Proficient/Advanced in reading and 36–53% in math), this subgroup is performing 30–40 percentage points lower.

6th Grade (IEP Subgroup)

Reading

- 92% Below Basic/Basic
- 9% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Nearly all students struggle with reading; no students scored Advanced.

Math

- 92% Below Basic/Basic

- 9% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Math mirrors reading—extremely low performance, with only 1% at Advanced.

7th Grade (IEP Subgroup)

Reading

- 88% Below Basic/Basic
- 11% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Slight improvement in reading compared to 6th, but still fewer than 1 in 8 are meeting grade-level expectations.

Math

- 94% Below Basic/Basic
- 5% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Math is highly concerning—only 1% Proficient and 4% Advanced, while the vast majority are Below Basic.

8th Grade (IEP Subgroup)

Reading

- 87% Below Basic/Basic
- 13% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Reading shows a small uptick in proficiency, but the majority remain far below grade-level standards.

Math

- 93% Below Basic/Basic
- 6% Proficient/Advanced
  ➡️ Math outcomes are the weakest area—nearly all students are performing at Below Basic or Basic levels.

Overall Trends & Key Takeaways

- Reading:
  - Between 87–92% of IEP students are Below Basic/Basic across grades.
  - Proficiency peaks at just 13% in 8th grade, with no Advanced scores at any level.
- Math:
  - Even lower than reading—92–94% Below Basic/Basic across grades.
  - Proficiency rates are between 5–9%, with only rare cases of Advanced performance.
- Achievement Gap: Compared to overall school performance (about 50–55% Proficient/Advanced in reading and 36–53% in math), students on IEPs are performing 40–45 percentage points lower.

1) High-priority findings

- Math is the biggest academic weakness across the board and worsens by grade: schoolwide 8th grade math proficiency is low (~36% Proficient/Advanced schoolwide and much lower for subgroups); Economically Disadvantaged and IEP students show very low proficiency (e.g., ED 8th math Proficient/Advanced ~16%; IEP 8th math Proficient/Advanced ~6%; Racial/Ethnic subgroup single digits).
- Racial/Ethnic and IEP subgroups show extremely low performance in both reading and math (often <10% proficient in 7th–8th), indicating large achievement gaps.
- Economically Disadvantaged students perform substantially below overall rates (roughly 10–20 points lower), especially in middle/high grades and in math.
- Advanced performance is almost non-existent in multiple subgroups — very few students are attaining the highest levels.

2) Student needs (what students need most)

1. Intensive, grade-level & standards-aligned math interventions (especially 7th–8th): reteach critical prerequisite skills, scaffolded instruction, and small-group, high-dosage tutoring.
2. Targeted literacy supports for older students (7th–8th), since reading proficiency drops in 8th. Literacy across content areas (vocabulary, comprehension strategies).
3. Special education supports that accelerate learning (IEP students): specially designed instruction, access to grade-level curriculum with appropriate accommodations/modifications, frequent progress monitoring.
4. Tiered interventions (RTI/MTSS) with measurable goals (Tier 2 small groups; Tier 3 intensive one-to-one or very small groups).
5. Social-emotional and attendance supports tied to academic engagement — many students in ED and subgroup populations benefit from wraparound supports that reduce barriers to learning.

3) Teacher needs

1. High-quality, ongoing professional development (PD) in mathematics instruction — content knowledge, standards-aligned curriculum use, formative assessment, and differentiation. Focus on middle-school math pedagogy and scaffolding for students behind grade level.
2. Training in evidence-based intervention models (e.g., high-dosage tutoring, formative assessment for learning, small-group guided math).
3. Coaching and job-embedded support (instructional coaches, in-class modeling, data-cycle coaching) so PD transfers to practice.
4. Special education & co-teaching skill development to improve service delivery in inclusive settings.
5. Supports for culturally responsive pedagogy and family engagement practices to reach the racial/ethnic subgroup effectively.

4) School/system needs

1. Coordinated MTSS system with clear criteria for entry/exit, evidence-based intervention menu, universal screener schedule, and data meeting cadence.

2. Reliable interim assessment and data systems (e.g., STAR, MAP, district common assessments) and weekly/monthly data review protocols for progress monitoring.
3. Extended learning time (after-school tutoring, Saturday academies, summer bridge) targeted to mathematics and grade-level literacy.
4. Staffing adjustments to allow smaller groups (e.g., interventionists, math specialists, paraprofessionals trained for interventions).
5. Family engagement & communication infrastructure (interpreters, flexible meeting times, targeted outreach for high-need families).
6. Resource alignment — curricular materials aligned to standards for math and reading, and materials for intervention programs.

5) Community & family needs

1. **S**tronger outreach to economically disadvantaged families (transportation, childcare during events, phone/text communication, translated materials).
2. Partnerships with community organizations for tutoring, mentoring, mental health, and basic needs (food, clothing) to reduce non-academic barriers.
3. Opportunities for parents to learn how to support learning at home (math/literacy nights, short how-to guides for grade-level skills).

3. Schoolwide Plan Strategies

✅ By checking this box, the school principal certifies that the schoolwide plan includes a description of the strategies that the school will be implementing to address school needs, including a description of how such strategies will –

- provide opportunities for all children, including each of the subgroups of students (as defined in ESEA Section 1111(c)(2)) to meet the challenging state academic standards;
- use methods and instructional strategies (consider evidence-based strategies as defined in ESEA Section 8101(21)) that strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education;
- 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; ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)
- provide professional development (as defined in ESEA Section 8101(42)) 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.

Additional factors to consider when selecting strategies to be included in the schoolwide program -

- preschool programs ESEA Section 1114(c)
- delivery of services by nonprofit or for-profit external providers ESEA Section 1114(d)
- dual or concurrent enrollment programs ESEA Section 1114(e)

Expectations

1. Strategies provide a detailed, enriched, and accelerated curriculum for all students, including each of the subgroups, according to their needs.

2. The school provides multiple opportunities and evidence-based interventions for students in need and address the outcomes of the comprehensive needs assessment in a way that will result in significant improvements in student learning.
3. Timely, effective and additional assistance is provided for students experiencing difficulty mastering the state's standards through activities which may include: counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services, mentoring services, postsecondary education preparation, transition from preschool to local elementary school programs.
4. The school uses clear criteria and processes for student participation in a tiered model to prevent and address behavior problems and early intervention services.
5. The school uses clear criteria and processes for making decisions regarding level and length of student participation in tiered supports.
6. The school offers a range of extended learning opportunities within and beyond the school day and the school year.
7. Professional development and other activities are offered for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments.
8. The school uses clear, diverse strategies to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects.

Addressing the above expectations, describe in the box below the strategies the school will use to upgrade the entire educational program in order to improve the achievement of the lowest performing students, including how and when these strategies will be implemented. These strategies should be linked to areas identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and the site budget.

1. Detailed, enriched, and accelerated curriculum for all students and subgroups

- Adopt and implement standards-aligned, evidence-based math and literacy curricula (e.g., Illustrative Math, Into Literature) across all grades with scaffolded supports for struggling learners and enrichment extensions for advanced learners.
- Provide differentiated instruction through small-group rotations, leveled texts, and tiered math tasks to meet subgroup needs (Economically Disadvantaged, Racial/Ethnic, Students on IEPs).
- Integrate project-based learning and STEM opportunities to enrich curriculum and engage students in critical thinking, problem-solving, and real-world applications.
- Offer accelerated coursework and advanced learning pathways to ensure high-achieving students are challenged and subgroup students have access to advanced pathways.

2. Evidence-based interventions for students in need

- Establish a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) with clear entry/exit criteria based on universal screeners (STAR, OSTP, district benchmarks).
- Implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in reading and math: high-dosage tutoring, small-group re-teaching, and research-based intervention programs

- Provide specialized supports for Students on IEPs including co-teaching, small-group resource classes, and progress monitoring every 2–4 weeks.
- Use data teams/PLCs to review student progress every 6–8 weeks and adjust interventions quickly.

3. Timely, effective, and additional assistance

- Counseling & school-based mental health services: Partner with local agencies for on-site counselors; provide social-emotional learning (SEL) lessons weekly during advisory.
- Specialized instructional support services: Speech-language, occupational therapy, and behavior support teams available to targeted students.
- College & career readiness exposure: Begin early with career days, AVID strategies, and collaboration with Choctaw High School to prepare students for postsecondary success.

4. Tiered behavior and early intervention services

- Implement PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports) schoolwide with consistent expectations, recognition systems, and reteaching strategies.
- Use universal screeners for behavior (BESS, Panorama, etc.) to identify students at risk.
- Provide Tier 2 supports such as check-in/check-out, social skills groups, and targeted counseling.
- Tier 3 supports include individualized behavior intervention plans, wraparound services, and collaboration with outside agencies.

5. Criteria for tiered supports and length of participation

- Entry criteria: Universal screener scores below benchmark, OSTP Below Basic/Basic, teacher referral, chronic absenteeism, or repeated discipline referrals.
- Exit criteria: Demonstrated growth on progress monitoring tools, consistent proficiency in classroom performance, improved attendance/behavior data.
- Duration: Minimum 6–8 weeks of Tier 2 before reevaluation; Tier 3 remains as long as data indicate need, reviewed every 4 weeks.
- Clear documentation: Student Support Team records and progress monitoring logs are kept in a central data system.

6. Extended learning opportunities

- Before- and after-school tutoring focused on math and literacy, staffed by certified teachers and supported with Title I funds.
- Enrichment clubs and electives (STEM, robotics, arts, coding, writing competitions) to extend learning beyond remediation.

7. Professional development for teachers and staff

- Ongoing job-embedded PD in:
  - Standards-based math and literacy instruction
  - Differentiation for subgroup needs (ED, IEP, racial/ethnic)
  - Culturally responsive teaching
  - Formative assessment/data analysis for instructional decisions
- Instructional coaching cycles: Observations, co-teaching, feedback loops.
- Paraprofessional training to support interventions effectively.
- Mental health/SEL PD for all staff to better identify and respond to student needs.

8. Recruitment and retention of effective teachers

- **Recruitment strategies:**
  - Partnerships with local universities (UCO, OU, OSU) for student teaching pipelines.
  - "Grow Your Own" program to develop paraprofessionals into certified teachers.
  - Competitive incentives for high-need subject areas (math, special education).
- **Retention strategies:**
  - Mentoring program for new teachers (buddy teacher system + coaching support).
  - Recognition and stipends for teachers who excel in high-need areas.
  - Provide leadership opportunities for effective teachers (PLC leads, curriculum leaders).
  - Create supportive culture through reduced class sizes in intervention settings, coaching, and protected planning time.

Nicoma Park Middle School will implement a comprehensive, data-driven, schoolwide Title I program designed to:

- Enrich and accelerate curriculum for *all* students while closing subgroup gaps.
- Deliver evidence-based interventions (MTSS, tutoring, extended learning).
- Provide wraparound supports (counseling, mentoring, SEL, transitions).
- Use clear tiered systems for academics and behavior, monitored through regular data cycles.
- Offer extended opportunities within and beyond the school day.
- Strengthen staff through targeted professional development and coaching.
- Recruit and retain effective teachers, especially in math and special education.

These strategies directly address the comprehensive needs assessment results — especially the gaps in math, subgroup achievement, and lack of advanced performance — with the goal of producing significant, measurable improvement in student learning.

4. Coordination and Integration
Select only one box. ✅ By checking this box, the school principal certifies that, if appropriate and applicable, the schoolwide plan was developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state, and local services, resources, and programs, and the schoolwide plan outlines the ways in which funds are to be braided (in project 511). ESEA Section 1114(b)(5) **OR** ☐ By checking this box, the school principal certifies that, if state, local and other federal programs are to be consolidated in project 785, then the schoolwide plan outlines the ways in which funds will be used to meet the intent and purpose of each program that was consolidated. ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(B)
Expectations
1. Leverages sufficient resources (i.e., fiscal, human, time) to improve student outcomes. 2. Leverages funding streams to connect the reform strategies developed. 3. Outlines how the school will meet the intents and purposes of each funding source. 4. Outlines how funds from Title I and other state and federal education programs will be used to meet the intent and purpose of the programs.
Addressing the above expectations, describe in the box below the ways in which funds (e.g., Title III, Part A, donations, competitive grants) are to be braided in the Title I schoolwide program.
Nicoma Park Middle School leverages fiscal, human, and time resources strategically to maximize impact on student learning. All federal, state, and local funding sources are braided together to avoid duplication and ensure alignment with the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Schoolwide Reform Strategies. Title I funds focus on direct student supports and interventions; Title II builds staff capacity; Title IV enriches the whole child experience; IDEA-B ensures special education access; and state/local funds maintain core instructional operations. Together, these resources will accelerate outcomes for all students while closing achievement gaps for subgroups.

5. Evaluation and Plan Revision
✅ By checking this box, the school principal certifies that the plan will be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging state academic standards. ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)
Expectations
1. School leadership, including families and community stakeholders, regularly monitors and adjusts implementation of the Title I schoolwide plan based on short- and long-term goals for student outcomes, as well as measures to evaluate high-quality implementation. 2. The monitoring and revising of the Title I schoolwide plan includes regular analysis of multiple types of data (i.e., student learning, demographic, process, perception) and necessary adjustments are made to increase student learning. 3. School leadership, including families and community stakeholders, and instructional staff regularly analyze interim and summative assessment data to evaluate instructional practices, determine patterns of student achievement, growth, and changes in growth gaps across classrooms, grade levels, and content areas.

Addressing the above expectations, describe in the box below how the school, with assistance from the LEA, will annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the state's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement to determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the state's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

1. Leadership & Stakeholder Monitoring

- School Leadership Team (SLT): Comprised of administrators, instructional coaches, department chairs, counselors, special education staff, and Title I coordinator. Meets quarterly to monitor progress toward short- and long-term student outcome goals including stakeholders, and family members.
- Student Voice: Perception surveys and focus groups are used to gather student perspectives on instructional practices, engagement, and school climate.

2. Monitoring & Revising the Schoolwide Plan

- Regular Reviews: The Title I plan is a living document reviewed quarterly by the SLT and revised annually based on performance data and feedback from families and staff.
- Goal Alignment: Progress is measured against both short-term goals (benchmarks in interim assessments, attendance rates, discipline data) and long-term goals (OSTP performance, subgroup growth, graduation readiness indicators).
- Adjustments: If benchmarks show lack of progress (e.g., subgroup gaps persist, intervention strategies not effective), immediate revisions are made to instructional supports, resource allocation, or professional development focus.

3. Use of Multiple Types of Data

- Student Learning Data: OSTP results, STAR Reading/Math progress monitoring, benchmark assessments, grades, and intervention tracking.
- Demographic Data: Enrollment trends, subgroup representation (economically disadvantaged, racial/ethnic, IEP, EL).
- Process Data: Fidelity checks of intervention programs, PLC collaboration logs, instructional walkthroughs.
- Perception Data: Student, family, and staff surveys about school climate, instruction, and support services.

4. Analysis of Interim & Summative Data

- Instructional Staff Role: Teachers engage in monthly PLC data meetings to review interim assessment results, identify trends, and adjust instructional practices.
- Grade-Level Teams: Analyze subgroup data (economically disadvantaged, IEP, racial/ethnic) to determine growth gaps and implement targeted interventions.
- Leadership Team Role: Cross-analyzes interim and summative data to evaluate instructional effectiveness across grade levels and content areas.

5. Measures to Evaluate High-Quality Implementation

- Fidelity Checks: Monitoring use of evidence-based programs (progress monitoring tools, walkthroughs, coaching cycles).
- Professional Development Evaluation: Teacher surveys, coaching feedback, and classroom observation data used to ensure PD is translating into improved practice.
- Stakeholder Feedback: Parent surveys provide input on program effectiveness and family engagement efforts.
- Accountability: Clear documentation of adjustments (e.g., reallocating Title I funds, modifying intervention schedules) is kept in the Schoolwide Plan for transparency and compliance.

Nicoma Park Middle School ensures that the Title I Schoolwide Plan is not static but adaptive, with leadership, families, and staff working together to monitor outcomes, review multiple data types, and make timely adjustments. This cycle of continuous improvement ensures equity, accelerates learning for all students, and addresses subgroup achievement gaps through a data-driven, collaborative approach.