

Hendry County Schools

Labelle Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Labelle Middle School

8000 E COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

<http://lms.hendry-schools.org/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), 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 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); 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, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), 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; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to set the foundation for our students to be able to make responsible decisions and become independent, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As educators, guardians, and community partners, we will prepare students for lifelong challenges in an ever changing and diverse world by inspiring and empowering them with academic, emotional, and social opportunities for growth.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Klinger, John	Principal	Instructional leader responsible for all curriculum, instruction and assessment tasks as well as building operational responsibilities. Ensures professional development is provided to meet the needs of staff. Provides oversight for all school processes identifying needs and allocating resources to meet those needs.
Ruiz, Heather	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in providing leadership and support. Assists in identifying needs and providing support to meet those needs. Communicates with school stakeholders. Provides supervision, instructional coaching, assistance and evaluation for the ELA department.
Marquez, Jose Luis	Dean	Dean of students focusing on student discipline, PBIS and school-wide expectations. Provides instructional coaching and support to the Social Studies department.
Gallegos, Rudy	Dean	Dean of curriculum. Oversees teacher professional development focusing on classroom management and effective procedures. Provides instructional coaching to the Science and Electives department.
Salinas, Jena	Reading Coach	Provides support to teachers through instructional coaching and professional development.
Steffes, Jill	Instructional Coach	Provides support to teachers through instructional coaching and professional development.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school improvement plan will be presented to the school's School Advisory Council and it will be given an opportunity to provide input. The school's improvement plans will also be shared during parent meetings.

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's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement plan will be monitored by the School Leadership team. Classroom instruction will be reviewed weekly. School data will be reviewed on a continuing basis and improvement plans will be adjusted in accordance with data milestones. Professional Learning Communities meet weekly and are tasked to monitor data and adjust plans accordingly. Classroom monitoring and data review meetings will be held with the district leadership team quarterly.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	83%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 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)* 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.	2021-22: C

	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	75	88	230	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	41	43	109	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	105	54	192	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	56	78	176	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	78	82	242	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	100	67	248	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	45	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	117	99	288

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	9	31	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially 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 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	59	51	158	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	58	105	184	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	50	121	209	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	77	123	278	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	64	95	256	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	0	49	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	69	126	255	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	1	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	59	51	158	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	58	105	184	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	50	121	209	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	77	123	278	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	64	95	256	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	0	49	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	69	126	255

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	1	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that 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.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	42	41	49	36	37	50	38		
ELA Learning Gains				39			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				23			30		
Math Achievement*	48	46	56	47	27	36	37		
Math Learning Gains				52			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			50		
Science Achievement*	35	39	49	39	46	53	39		
Social Studies Achievement*	83	73	68	47	50	58	54		
Middle School Acceleration	55	59	73	49	53	49	48		
Graduation Rate					42	49			
College and Career Acceleration					60	70			
ELP Progress	62	61	40	61	54	76	50		

** 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.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 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%
SWD	24	Yes	4	2
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	2	2
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			

2022-23 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%
FRL	51			

2021-22 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%
SWD	22	Yes	3	1
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	43			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	42			

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. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	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	42			48			35	83	55			62
SWD	16			34			9		38		4	
ELL	21			37			13		57		5	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			33			24				3	
HSP	43			50			34	86	56		6	61
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	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
PAC												
WHT	42			46			45	65	51		5	
FRL	39			46			32	76	53		6	60

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	36	39	23	47	52	51	39	47	49			61
SWD	16	24	12	27	36	27	18	18				
ELL	17	25	13	34	41	40	18	27	50			61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	12	26	29	21	39	43		33				
HSP	36	39	21	47	51	49	36	44	48			61
MUL	50	58		36	64							
PAC												
WHT	45	41	24	50	59	66	59	62	49			
FRL	33	37	21	45	52	47	35	45	50			56

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	38	40	30	37	36	50	39	54	48			50
SWD	17	36	28	22	40	43	22	39	33			
ELL	24	36	29	25	41	51	11	41	19			50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	30	20	23	26	43	29					
HSP	37	40	33	37	38	53	38	52	45			51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43	37	19	43	35	42	41	71	56			
FRL	34	36	27	35	37	54	38	52	46			46

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	39%	38%	1%	47%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	40%	-2%	47%	-9%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	38%	0%	47%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	37%	4%	54%	-13%
07	2023 - Spring	39%	34%	5%	48%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	36%	18%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	34%	31%	3%	44%	-10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	32%	53%	50%	35%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	22%	55%	48%	29%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	50%	31%	66%	15%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

According to PM3 data, our 7th grade ELA data had the lowest performance at 37% proficient.

Contributing Factors: Our 7th grade ELA team was predominately new teachers who lacked the knowledge of the the 7th grade ELA standards. One of the teachers on that team was brand new to the country, so she was not only learning the standards/curriculum, but also a whole new culture. Planning sessions did not follow the PLC planning protocol.

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

According to 22/23 PM3 data, 6th grade Math showed the greatest decline in proficiency compared to the 21/22 school year. Proficiency went from 56% in 2022 to 41% in 2023.

Contributing factors: Our 6th grade math team was a new team. There was a team member that was not only new to our school, but new to the country. This meant they were learning a new curriculum, standards and culture. Also, the curriculum and standards for math changed for the 22/23 school year. It was expected that there was a slight dip in scores.

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.

According to PM3 data, 6th grade Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average was 54% and our 6th grade math average was 41%. This was a 13% difference.

Contributing Factors: Our 6th grade math team was a new team. There was a team member that was not only new to our school, but new to the country. This meant they were learning a new curriculum, standards and culture. Also, the curriculum and standards for math changed for the 22/23 school year. It was expected that there was a slight dip in scores.

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

According to PM3 data, 8th grade Math showed the most improvement. Proficiency was 54% for the 22/23 school year and only 35% for the 21/22 school year. This is a 19% improvement.

New actions: Our 8th grade math team was comprised of veteran teachers. Our instructional coach was the lead teacher for the Math team. Planning sessions focused on data based instruction. Department meetings occurred every week in addition to cohort planning sessions.

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

A major area of concern is student attendance. 28% percent of students had 10% or more days absent for the 22/23 school year.

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

Data Focused Planning
Disciplinary Literacy
Instructional Coaching
Targeted Small Group Interventions

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

LaBelle Middle School has three low-performing subgroups, ELLs, SWDs, and African Americans. Compared to last year, absences for Hispanic students increased by 23%. Compared to last year, absences for African American students increased by 11%. Compared to last year, absences for SWD increased by 15%. Compared to last year, absences for ELL students increased by 23%. Compared to last year, absences for White students increased by 29%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the End of the Year, students in the three low-performing subgroups will demonstrate more than 1 year of growth as measured by the FAST.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be monitored with bi-weekly assessments following the intensive reading plan developed in their respective class; ELL class, Learning Strategies, Intensive Reading Class. Data will be monitored by the reading coach. Classroom instruction will be monitored via weekly classroom visits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jena Salinas (salinasj@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The critical reading process is an AVID strategy that supports struggling readers by setting a precedent for effective reading by working through three phases to navigate through any text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ultimately, the data shows that our lowest three sub-groups have reading deficiencies. As part of being an AVID based school, the critical reading process is a strategy from AVID that teachers can model with any text to support struggling readers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Tiering the ESOL reading classes. There will be one period for newcomers and two periods for intermediate students in the ELL program. Students in the ELL program will also be targeted in small group instruction. PM1 and PM2 data will be used to inform and drive instruction for this subgroup. Instructional coach support will also be provided.

Person Responsible: Jena Salinas (salinasj@hendry-schools.net)

By When: This will be monitored quarterly.

A more structured reading plan for learning strategies classes will be provided. A more structured plan for collaboration between ELA teachers and collaborative teachers/paras will be developed. PM1 and PM2 data will be used to inform and drive instruction for this subgroup. Instructional coach support will be provided.

Person Responsible: Jena Salinas (salinasj@hendry-schools.net)

By When: This will be monitored through weekly classroom visits. Administrators, coaches and lead teachers will be present in weekly PLC meetings to ensure this is addressed.

More structured instructional plan for intensive classes will be developed. Targeted small group instruction for MTSS students will be provided. A more structured plan for collaboration between ELA teachers and collaborative teachers/paras will be made. PM1 and PM2 data will be used to inform and drive instruction for this subgroup. Instructional coach support will be provided.

Person Responsible: Rhonda Kosh (koshr@hendry-schools.net)

By When: A plan to support students in MTSS will be completed by the end of August. This plan will be reviewed and adjusted as needed, and will be reviewed quarterly.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

LaBelle Middle School will improve instruction and student outcomes in ELA and Math by supporting and enhancing the effectiveness of our PLC process. The rationale for this is that the school has experienced a high turn over of teachers. Data demonstrates teacher adjustment to new curriculum and standards has impacted student outcomes. An effective PLC process is vital to supporting teachers in providing effective instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

LaBelle Middle School's measurable outcome for ELA is to increase by 7 points student outcomes in Achievement, Gains, and Gains of the lowest 25%. Our measurable outcome for Math is to increase Achievement by 9 points and Gains and Gains for the lowest 25% by 8 points. Our measurable outcome for Science is to increase achievement by 5 points. Our measurable outcome in Civics is 75% of students passing the EOC.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Departments will use FAST 1 and 2 to monitor student progress toward the measurable outcome. Departments will discuss this and other student outcome data during weekly PLC meetings to monitor progress and adjust plans to meet student needs. Departments will share data and planning with the school leadership team during monthly meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Klinger (klingerj@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Dufour's PLC Process and LSI's Marzano Standards Based Planning protocol will give teachers a foundation and guidance on how to plan and collaborate effectively in a PLC using data to drive instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy aligns with our schools evaluation system and district's strategic plan of increasing student academic achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Use the PLC process to support teacher use of data to improve core instruction as well as small group targeted instruction.

Person Responsible: Heather Ruiz (ruizh@hendry-schools.net)

By When: This will be monitored weekly as administrators, coaches and lead teachers attend weekly PLC meetings.

Support planning and coordination between core teachers and collaborative teachers and paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible: Jill Steffes (steffesj@hendry-schools.net)

By When: All staff will receive Professional Learning related to collaborative teaching techniques in August. Administrators and coaches will monitor implementation through weekly classroom visits.

Support teachers in providing effective interventions by providing targeted PL to intervention teachers in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Jena Salinas (salinasj@hendry-schools.net)

By When: ELA and Math intervention teachers will be provided PL in August. PL will continue on a quarterly basis and as needed based on data.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Each school year teachers identify areas of need as indicated on growth plans. Data gathered from teacher growth plans indicate professional development needs in the following areas:

- Planning Standards-Based Units and Lessons
- Planning to Close the Achievement Gap using Data
- Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress
- Using Engagement Strategies
- Identifying Critical Content from Standards
- Using Questions to Help Students Elaborate on Content
- Helping Students Engage in Cognitively Complex Tasks

Professional Learning opportunities related to teacher practices and content specific professional learning will provide teachers with the self identified areas of need and demonstrate LaBelle Middle School's commitment to supporting and creating master teachers as well as increase teacher recruitment and retention.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Data provided during classroom observations entered into iObservation will determine the quality of use for each element listed above.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring will occur by classroom walk-throughs and individual meetings with teachers to discuss implementation of strategies as well as to refocus teacher efforts on self identified areas of need/support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

As described by (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Poekert, 2011), effective professional development should include active involvement, on the teacher's part, in identifying their own learning needs and developing learning experiences to facilitate meeting those needs (Parker, Patton, & Tannehill, 2012).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing learning opportunities for teachers based on self-identified areas of interest and need has led to increased ownership and commitment to the success of the Professional Learning programs (Darling Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Deglau & O'Sullivan, 2006; Parker, Patton, Madden, & Sinclair, 2010). When the Professional Learning needs of teachers are considered, the likelihood of effective implementation, the quality of use of strategies increases, as well as the culture and climate surrounding the Professional Learning environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The LaBelle Middle School administration team along with instructional coaches and lead teachers will meet to develop a list of specific PL to include the areas/elements of need determined by teachers. As the school year progresses we will also identify and include any other PL deemed critical to the betterment of our teachers and students.

A list of PL will be sent to all teachers to recruit potential facilitators. We will also reach out to Heartland Education Consortium to determine the availability PL offerings both on and off campus.

Person Responsible: Jose Luis Marquez (marquezl@hendry-schools.net)

By When: A preliminary list of PL will be created by the first Professional day, August 30th. We will continue to offer PL opportunities throughout the school year during Professional Day.

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

All requests for funding are submitted via purchase order request to the school bookkeeper. The school bookkeeper will identify the appropriate funding source. All funding must be approved by the principal and will be considered based on how it aligns to the School Improvement Plan and available funding. LaBelle Middle prioritizes school funds and federal funds to activities that support the school improvement plan.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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 the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The dissemination of the SIP will be presented to teachers in staff meetings. It will also be shared on social media/school page. The School Improvement Plan will be presented via slide presentation in English and in Spanish. Parent surveys will be presented at Title 1 parent night to gain input on how LMS can better improve student academic, parent/community involvement. Lastly, the SIP will be shared during the SAC meetings for stakeholders.

<https://www.hendry-schools.org/Page/11>

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 Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

LMS plans to conduct quarterly parent-teacher conferences as well as individual parent-teacher conferences at the parent/teacher's request to build positive relationships with parents and families. Title 1 Parent Night and Student Expos will also be used as a way to showcase students' achievements. We strive to seek input from parents during the planning process and communicate data during SAC meetings. All information presented is available in English and Spanish.

School Counselors will conduct an informational night for parents of students with disabilities and for our English Language Learners (ELLs). Parents will learn about various student support programs, such as the MTSS, PBIS, Exceptional Student Education (ESE), and English Language Learners (ELL) programs to gain a better understanding of support programs offered at LaBelle Middle School.

<https://www.hendry-schools.org/Page/11>

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 III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our school plans to strengthen academic programs in our school is to utilize and increase AVID engagement strategies in the classroom. WICOR strategies as part of AVID will support the quality of learning and provide an enriched curriculum for students to engage in. Specifically, we want students to engage in focused note-taking strategies and literacy in the content areas. We will use i-Ready and Nearpod as additional resources to strengthen the academic program in the school.

Instructional coaches will work closely with teachers to ensure quality instruction to increase engagement strategies, and AVID implementation to student achievement, and Professional Learning needs. Lastly, we will strengthen relational capacity in our school amongst teachers which will impact student achievement.

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 ESSA, 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). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Use of additional support from Title 1 paraprofessionals.

Using the push-in model- Paraprofessionals will push in to classrooms to help students with needs in the general education classroom setting.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Multi-Tiered System of Supports "MTSS" is a tiered, proactive framework that integrates data and instruction to maximize student achievement and support student social, emotional, behavioral, and academic needs from a strength-based approach. School faculty, parents, and other direct stakeholders can refer a student to MTSS.

The 2x10 strategy will be used to improve relational capacity. It supports students through an adult staff member spending two minutes per day for ten consecutive school days in a row connecting with a student individually and offering extra social-emotional support. Educators (or school leaders) select a particular student and set a goal to engage in a 2-minute conversation with the direct goal of building a positive, meaningful rapport with the student.

Youth Mental Health training for ALL staff is required with mandated training every three (3) years. This statewide and school initiative helps close the gap between students with mental health challenges and untrained adults.

Check and Connect - An intervention used with students who show warning signs of disengagement with school and who are at risk of dropping out. Check and Connect is a trusting relationship between the student and a caring, trained mentor who both advocates for and challenges the students to keep education at the forefront.

Suite 360 will be used to deliver required mental health instruction and is part of LaBelle Middle School's social and emotional curriculum that fosters a compensative-oriented social-emotional learning platform. Suite 360 also offers resources to students seeking social-emotional support. Students will utilize Suite 360 during their Bronco Block intervention period consisting of 30 minutes of social-emotional inventions.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

AVID

LMS offers AVID courses for all grade levels throughout the day. Our AVID site coordinator along with the AVID Team has provided professional learning on AVID strategies such as Focused Note Taking and Relational Capacity. Visits to colleges and other post-secondary institutions will also be arranged.

CTE

Students are enrolled in Career Themed Educational courses.

We will present a Career Day to expose students to different careers available locally. Local businesses will be invited to demonstrate the skills and education needed to obtain a job with their organization.

XELLO

We will use this software to help students engage in college and career readiness. This will help students explore post secondary goals/options.

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. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

PBIS

Teachers will receive training on implementing classroom PBIS strategies that motivate students to reach academic goals. We will also be implementing school wide incentives such as the Level Up Club in addition to events that reward positive behaviors that will be held during half days. Grade level cohorts will sponsor/host events.

MTSS

Tier 1 includes academic, social, emotional, and behavioral curriculum, instruction, and supports aligned to grade-level standards and student needs.

At Tier 2, schools provide small group, standardized academic interventions or targeted behavioral or mental health supports using validated intervention programs.

At Tier 3, schools implement intensive intervention to help students with severe and persistent learning and/or behavioral needs, including students with disabilities.

PRO

Students are reminded of the school wide expectations as found within the PRO model.

Positive

Respectful

Organized

Discipline Procedures

Prior to students returning, teachers received training on the LMS tiered discipline procedures. Teachers were given instruction on how to manage minor discipline issues in the classroom using a tiered approach. Teachers track warnings, reteach expectations at each tier, and explain the next subsequent consequence if students choose not to follow expectations. Teachers were directed to choose consequences that fall within a tiered threshold level to provide consistency school wide. Teachers, counselors, and administrators will use a 2x10 strategy to build greater relationships with students that have two or more referrals in a single classroom.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

We provide professional learning opportunities throughout the school year both in person and virtually in coordination with our half day professional learning days once a month. One of our goals is to have the majority of our teachers AVID trained, and we sent numerous teachers to AVID training this past summer. We continue to provide ongoing professional learning on AVID strategies school-wide like Focused Note-Taking and Building Relational Capacity. We also support our teachers with professional learning on the PLC process and Standards-Based Planning Protocol. An initial training was given on August 1st for grade level cohorts with a deeper dive into the process by departments on August 7th and 8th. Another source of professional learning comes from the Heartland Educator Consortium that our school is a part of along with other surrounding school districts. Teachers can participate in the various professional learning opportunities they host via in person or online courses.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes