Clewiston Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Clewiston Middle School

601 W PASADENA AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=6&sc_id=1171294169

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.

The mission of Clewiston Middle School is to Engage, Empower, and Educate EVERY student, EVERY day, in EVERY classroom to prepare them for success in college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clewiston Middle School will be a place of limitless opportunities for ALL students. Our school will be student led and teacher facilitated. By the year 2025, Clewiston Middle School will have 70% proficiency in all four core subjects. Students will leave with at least one Career and Professional Education (CAPE) certification.
It will be the middle school of choice for the stakeholders in the southeast region!

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
Kelley, Tina	Principal	Instructional leader responsible for leading learning and establishing a positive culture for students, staff, and stakeholders.
Perrera, Auria	Reading Coach	Support teachers by providing instructional coaching specifically in ELA, Science, and Civics. Management of the school website and assisting in school social media.
Perry, Sandra	Instructional Coach	Support teachers by providing instructional coaching with a strong focus on reading and AVID. Oversees PBIS.
Barnes, Steven	Dean	Instructional support for social studies elective teachers that specialize in certifications. Dean of Students giving oversight to student discipline. School site technology representative at the district level and school site safety lead.
Pruitt, Timothy	Dean	Dean of Students specializing in Tier 2 and ESE student discipline. Instructional Coach and support for math. Gives oversite to facilities maintenance.
Hughes, Wanda	School Counselor	Counselor for students with alpha A-L, students with a 504 plan, and our ELL students. Oversees mandated SEL and mental health.
Wilson, Jacque	School Counselor	Counselor for students with alpha M-Z, students with an IEP. Serves on threat assessment team.
Wilson, William	Other	MTSS Coordinator Oversite to campus mentoring program
Porth, Ivette	ELL Compliance Specialist	Gives oversite to ELL Compliance, small group support for Tier 3 and ELL students
Johnston, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Instructional coaching and support for 8th Grade Science Instructional coaching and support for deans Testing Coordinator

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.

CMS met regularly with our leadership team and involved them as well as our entire staff in data analysis that drove the development of the SIP goals and Parent and Family Engagement Plan for 23-24 SY. We also met with our student leaders and included them in the analysis of the 22-23 SY data. We allowed them to participate in the establishing of goals for the 23-24SY as well. We also used input from parents and the community via school to home/community surveys to create the PFEP.

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 SIP will be moniotred the following ways:
1. Weekly instructional walkthroughs with feedback to teachers.
2. Teacher Data chats focusing on instruction on student growth quarterly
3. Data Chats with collab teachers focusing on SWDs and their growth quarterly
4.Assistant Principal weekly data chats with ELL Resource teachers to monitor ELL growth
5. Principal will sit in planning meetings for ELA, Math, Science, and Civics and look for the implentation of best instruction practices such as WICOR in the planning process.
6. The PFEP will be monitored by evaluating parent and family involvement in the day to day function of the school as well as their participation in the 20 opportunities for engagement in the 23-24 SY.

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	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)

	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: D 2018-19: D 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	41	58	81	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	73	77	172
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	51	107	172
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	72	61	152
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	82	107	245
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	62	62	170
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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	39	100	128	267

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	38	52	56	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	11	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	47	43	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	61	53	135
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	88	103	252
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	71	85	218
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	32	42	89

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	38	80	79	197

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	2	2	1	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4

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	38	52	56	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	11	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	47	43	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	61	53	135
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	88	103	252
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	71	85	218
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	32	42	89

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	38	80	79	197

The number of students identified retained:

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

(The "Grade Level" header spans columns K–8.)

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 School	2023 District	2023 State	2022 School	2022 District	2022 State	2021 School	2021 District	2021 State
ELA Achievement*	41	41	49	37	37	50	42		
ELA Learning Gains				37			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			35		
Math Achievement*	44	46	56	46	27	36	51		
Math Learning Gains				49			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			42		
Science Achievement*	44	39	49	46	46	53	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	73	68	76	50	58	94		
Middle School Acceleration	69	59	73	65	53	49	75		
Graduation Rate					42	49			
College and Career Acceleration					60	70			
ELP Progress	57	61	40	63	54	76	49		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	21	Yes	4	4
ELL	37	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			

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	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	37	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	46			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	48			

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	41			44			44	68	69			57
SWD	17			18			11	37			4	
ELL	23			27			23	47	45		6	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			33			32	69	65		5	
HSP	45			46			47	69	66		5	
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			51			47	63	77		5	
FRL	37			41			38	64	67		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	37	37	27	46	49	55	46	76	65			63
SWD	12	23	21	19	39	40	17	42				
ELL	17	29	30	32	41	48	22	65	25			63
AMI												
ASN	73	100		91	100							
BLK	31	36	29	40	49	56	35	70	71			
HSP	39	36	23	46	44	49	48	80	63			60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	38	34	36	51	62	74	46	68	62			
FRL	34	34	25	43	46	52	42	75	66			61

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	42	47	35	51	46	42	47	94	75			49
SWD	18	38	31	25	31	21	14					
ELL	23	35	28	38	35	41	20	93				49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	41	44	42	44	35	33	95	100			
HSP	45	47	29	53	45	49	55	96	76			52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44	53	43	54	50	25	40	86	54			
FRL	41	47	32	49	45	43	44	97	78			50

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	32%	38%	-6%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	40%	1%	47%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	38%	4%	47%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	37%	19%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	34%	7%	48%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	36%	-2%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	43%	31%	12%	44%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	32%	43%	50%	25%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	50%	16%	66%	0%

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.

Our lowest data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA. Some contributing factors were: teachers knowledge of benchmarks and alignment of tasks.

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

Our Civics scores showed the greatest decline from the previous year going from 74% to 67%. One of the contributing factors included two new teachers who joined us with the TPG exchange teacher program, and had limited knowledge of civics benchmarks.

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.

Our data component that had the greatest gap was 8th grade pre-algebra with a 25 point gap. Our school was 31% and the state average is 56%. At Clewiston Middle School this component reflects students that were not proficient in 7th grade math and thus were not elibile to be in Algebra I honors. So these were our students that made a 1 or 2 in 7th grade math.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was 6th grade math with an increas of 15 points. We had an experienced teacher that lead strong collaboration and data driven planning. They also had extensive knowledge of their content standard and best practices for instruction in math.

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

At CMS, 28% of our students were absent 10 or more days.
And 37% of our truant students score a 1 on the ELA assessment.

As we look at both of these areas, we are aware of a great need for student engagement, teacher knowledge of benchmarks, and implementation gaps in planning system.

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

1. MTSS/Problem Solving - Attendance
2. Planning/Target -Task alignment- all core with a focus on ELA . Incorporating WICOR strategies as well as Course and Unit organizers.
3.Learning Gains and increased proficiency for ESSA subgroups

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.

Clewiston Middle School has two low-performing subgroups: SWDs and ELLs.
44% of our ESE students had less than a 90% attendance rate. Correspondingly, 63% of our truant SWD students scored a Level 1 or 2 on their FAST ELA.
85% of our ELL students had less than a 90% attendance rate.Correspondingly, 65% of those students scored a Level 1 or 2 on their FAST ELA.

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

Increase the number of SWD proficiency in reading from 34% to 42%.
Increase the number of ELL students that are proficient in ELA from 35% to 42%.

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

Consistent classroom learning walks
Common assessments in ELA 2x quarterly
Common formative assessments
FAST Progress Monitoring
I-ready reading

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tina Kelley (kelleyt@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.)

We will use Professional Learning Communities to focus on standards-based planning, teacher and student data analysis, common assessment in performance matters, planning protocols (before, during, after) for collaborative teaching.
What do we want students to learn? How will we know if they learned it? What will do if they don't learn it? What do we do for students that already have learned it?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers lack understanding of grade level standards which causes them to be unable to plan standards-based tasks affectively. Because teachers lack clarity of identifying the critical content from grade level standards, we will utilize the PLC process to improve teacher practice.
Collaborative teachers will plan with gen ed teacher to provide tiered instruction and small group acceleration for our SWD.
ELL teachers will plan with our ELL Reading Resource teacher to provide tiered instruction and small group acceleration for our ELL students.

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.

Collabortive teacher and gen ed teachers will analyze the historical data and strength/challenges of the SWD in their classroom. The CT and GE teacher will meet with the students and set individual goals including attendance as well as academic achievement goals.

Person Responsible: Jacque Wilson (wilsonj@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 18, 2023

Standards-based planning specific to ELLs. What do we want students to learn? How will we know if they learned it? What will do if they don't learn it?
What do we do for students that already have learned it?
Plans will incorporate WICOR strategies and IEP/ELL goal components of reading, writing, and speaking.

Person Responsible: Ivette Porth (porthi@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 5, 2023

Small Group Instruction for Acceleration. Teachers will utilize Iready for small group acceleration. Students will be grouped based on data.

Person Responsible: Ivette Porth (porthi@hendry-schools.net)

By When: October 18, 2023

Coaching Cycles for our ELA teachers that will involve learning walks to observe highly effective instruction with collaborative teachers on our campus.

Person Responsible: Auria Perrera (pereraa@hendry-schools.net)

By When: October 18, 2023

Quarterly Data Analysis with teachers and students. Analysis will include attendance and behavior as well as grades and assessments.
Students will use AVID binders and interactive notebooks to track their attendance.
Teachers will use common assessments to monitor student learning of standards and facilitate data chats with students.
Administration will meet quarterly for teacher data chats regarding student growth.

Person Responsible: Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

By When: October 18, 2023

Standards-based planning specific to SWDs. What do we want students to learn? How will we know if they learned it? What will do if they don't learn it?
What do we do for students that already have learned it?
Plans will incorporate WICOR strategies and IEP/ELL goal components of reading, writing, and speaking.

Person Responsible: Jacque Wilson (wilsonj@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 5, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Our lowest data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA. Some contributing facters were: teachers knowledge of benchmarks and alignment of tasks in planning and instruction.

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

Our school plans to implement effective planning to increase our ELA proficiency to 45% by FAST PM2 and 55% by FAST PM3.

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

This area will be monitored using progress monitoring specific to ELA. Progress monitoring includes but is not limited to:
Consistent classroom learning walks
Common assessments 2x quarterly
Common formative assessments
FAST Progress Monitoring
I-ready reading assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tina Kelley (kelleyt@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.)

Planning/Target -Task alignment- all core with a focus on ELA . Incorporating WICOR strategies as well as Course and Unit organizers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers lack understanding of grade level standards which causes them to be unable to plan standards-based tasks affectively and internalize content. Because teachers lack clarity of identifying the critical content from grade level standards, we will utilize the PLC process to improve teacher practice. 1. What do we want students to learn?
2. How will we know if they learned it?
3. What will do if they don't learn it?
4. What do we do for students that already have learned it?

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.

Improve Teacher Practice
Establish "look fors" for standards-based planning and best practices in instruction.
Teachers will be tiered based on classroom walkthroughs and historical data.
Once tiered, coaching cycles will begin that will involve observation of highly effective instruction, observation, feedback, action steps for adjustment, modeling effective instruction and continued cycles.

Person Responsible: Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 18, 2023

Standards-based Planning with implementation of WICOR strategies
Reading Coach will facilitate analyzation of ELA standards with item specs.

Teachers will plan using the 4 questions:1. What do we want students to learn? 2. How will we know if they learned it? 3. What will do if they don't learn it? 4. What do we do for students that already have learned it?

Plans will incorporate Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading (WICOR) strategies.

Instructional leaders will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor effective implementation and application of planned instruction.

Person Responsible: Auria Perrera (pereraa@hendry-schools.net)

By When: August 21, 2023

Teaching reading across all contents-ALL teachers will teach reading strategies and incorportate WICOR strategies into planning and instruction weekly.

Person Responsible: Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

By When: August 21, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

Our overall attendance rate dropped from 92% to 89%.
62% of our students with less than 90% attendance rate scored a Level 1 or 2 on their FAST ELA.
50% of our truant students are ESE and/or ELL.
Specifically, 85% of our ELL students had less than a 90% attendance rate.Correspondingly, 65% of those students scored a Level 1 or 2 on their FAST ELA.
44% of our ESE students had less than a 90% attendance rate. Correspondingly, 63% of our truant ESE students scored a Level 1 or 2 on their FAST ELA.

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

Overall, Schoolwide attendance will increase from 89% to 93%.
Specifically, ELL students with excessive absences will decrease from 85%-75%.
ESE students with excessive absences will decrease from 44%-to 34%.

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

Daily attendance reports focusing on students that have been identified with chronic attendance issues. Implement a Student Success Team (SST). Our team will consist of the ELL Resource teacher, the migrant Liason for ELL students, the ESE Guidance Counselor, the Dean for ESE students, the principal, assistant principal, registrar and PBIS lead.The team will meet weekly on Fridays to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Johnston (ortizs@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.)

1.SST members will connect with the families of students with 2 + absences in the first two weeks of school, 2-3 absences in the first 4 weeks of school, and 4+ absences in the first month of school.
2.The SST will implement a student success plan (SSP) with students that have 5+ absences which includes the following:
Personalized welcome-to-school calls from to students and families above within the first 4 weeks of school.
• Assign an attendance buddy/mentors for the above students which will connect with the student weekly before school,during lunch or Tiger Time, and/or at an after school activity (clubs, athletics, etc) The staff mentor will connect with parent weekly.
• The TIPS Coordinator will be on the team to involve social services and case management for students 20 percent absenteeism of school in the prior year and show signs of continued challenges.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research suggest that students are more likely to attend school when they feel connected to caring adults or fellow students who notice whether they show up and can help them overcome challenges to attendance.

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.

Implement a SSP Team. Our team will consist of the ELL Resource teacher, the migrant Liason for ELL students, the ESE Guidance Counselor, the Dean for ESE students, the principal, assistant principal and PBIS lead.The team will meet weekly on Fridays to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person Responsible: Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 7, 2023

SST members will connect with the families of students with 2 + absences in the first two weeks of school, 2-3 absences in the first 4 weeks of school, and 4+ absences in the first month of school.

Person Responsible: Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 7, 2023

The SST will implement a student success plan with students that have 5+ absences.
The plan includes the following:
Personalized welcome-to-school calls from
the team to students and families above within the first 4 weeks of school.
• Assign a student attendance buddies for the above students.
* Assign an adult mentor who will connect with the student weekly before school,during lunch or Tiger Time, and/or at an after school activity (clubs, athletics, etc) The staff mentor will connect with parent weekly.
• The school liason will be on the team for outside support for students and
families.
• The TIPS Coordinator will be on the team to involve social services and case management for students 20 percent absenteeism of
school in the prior year and show signs of continued challenges.

Person Responsible: Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Daily attendance reports focusing on students that have been identified with chronic attendance issues.

Person Responsible: Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Daily

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

This was identified as a crucial needs due to the fact that we had approximately 200 students that were required to attend summer school because they failed 2+ core subjects. The majority of the failing grades were due to imcomplete work and students refusing to do assignments.

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

Reduce the number of students requiring summer school (failing 2+ cores) by 50%.

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

This area will be monitored by:
Monitor Monday-CHeck gradebooks for students with missing assignment and/or failing grades.
Accountability conference with teacher to problem solve (Truant? Struggling academically? Instructional practice? Classroom routines?) .
Teachers follow up with parents and students. Document in gradebook.
CWT "look for" end of class procedure for turning in assignments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Johnston (ortizs@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.)

Students will check and chart their grades and missing assignments during Tiger Time (Student Advisory Period).
Teachers will dismiss class 2-3 minuted prior to the bell and stand at the door at dismissal to check for assignment completion and submission.
Admin will monitor progress reports and report cards and conduct data chats with the students and parents of students that are failing 2+ cores.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will not be successful if they are not completing assignments and turning them in on time. It will take students, teachers, and administrators to intervene early, often, and consistently in order for students to succeed.

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.

AVID Binders-Every student will receive an AVID Binder with a planner.
Teachers will facilitate the setting up of the binders and use them as a daily part of organization and instruction.

Person Responsible: Sandra Perry (perrys@hendry-schools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

Focused Note-taking
Admin will train all staff in Focused Note-taking and its effectiveness in student success.
ALL teachers will implement focused note-taking across all content including electives.

Person Responsible: Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 5, 2023

Teachers will incorporate an engagement strategy in their daily lesson plan.

Person Responsible: Auria Perrera (pereraa@hendry-schools.net)

By When: September 5, 2023

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).

Our school resources were evaluated and aligned with the greatest needs on our campus. We used Title I funding for the purchase of ELL curriculum and technology that will enhance and accelerate learning and language acquisition for our ELL students. We also added an additional allocation for a 2nd ELL teacher.
We allocated funds for student binders and planner to help with organizational and academic skills.
We used allocated funding for 21 teachers and staff member to be trained in WICOR strategies to incorporate best practices in instruction as well as increase student engagement.

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.

Hard copies of a summary of the SIP for teacher binders will be distributed during planning meetings to all teachers and instructional support.
Single sheet copies for students and families will be sent home with progress reports in English and Spanish.
A summary of the SIP in English and SPanish will be provided @ our SAC meeting during the 1st quarter.

Single Sheet copies will be posted on social media and school webpage in English and Spanish.
A summary of the SIP in English and SPanish will be provided @ Title I family night on September 12, 2023.

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))

Parent and Family Engagement Plans are created by all stakeholders at CMS. Parents, teachers, leaders and community members collaborate and provide input on the implementation of the PFEP based on surveys , discussions at SAC meetings, parent conferences and more. Parents and Families will have 20+ opportunities to connect and engage throughout the year which are all included in our PFEP. The PFEP will be posted in English and Spanish. Please see school webpage here: https://www.hendry-schools.org/domain/14

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 went from a 7 period day to a 6 period day which gives our students and teachers more time to focus on instruction.
We also have incorporated a Tiger Time at the end of the day where students will have time to check grades, do homework, receive tutoring, learn WICOR strategies to increas learning, and more.
Accelerated curriculum for ELL students and Tier 2 and 3 readers.
Additional teachers and instructional support staff for ESSA subgroups.

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))

Title I provides funding for reading resource teachers, paraprofessionals, and our migrant advocate. Title I also provides supplies and tutoring for migrant students.
Title II provides funding for professional learning, AVID, standards-based planning and data driven planning.
Title IX provides funding for our homeless after school program.
SAI FUnds (Education Enrichment Funds) provie after school tutoring and supplemental intervention supplies.
Food services provides snacks for our after school programs. School safety funds are utilized for implementation of safety teams and hardening of schools to keep our students and staff safe and allow for an atmosphere conducive to learning.