

Hendry County Schools

# Labelle High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Labelle High School

4050 E COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

[http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=3&sc\\_id=1171294169](http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=3&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 LaBelle High School is to:

- Discover your Strengths
- Reach you Goals
- Everyone is Included
- Achieve Greatness
- Model Success
- Serve Others

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our Vision.....

LaBelle High School students will be respectful, prepared, and engaged in the learning process.

LaBelle High School teachers will be professionals dedicated to preparing students for their individual futures and executing the policies set forth by the administration.

LaBelle High School parents will engage in a partnership with the school and their children.

The LaBelle High School Administration will set and equitably enforce policies that create and support an optimal learning environment.

By meeting these standards, the students, parents, and staff of LaBelle High School will be equal partners, sharing goals and high expectations, as students prepare for the future.

### 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
Bass, Tammy	Principal	
Helm, Justin	Assistant Principal	
Harris, Ryan	Assistant Principal	
Bechtel, Jessica	Dean	
McClain, Jenny	Dean	
Walker, Kristen	Dean	
Fricke, Jacob	Dean	
Brown, Michele	Reading Coach	
Tippett, David	Instructional Coach	

### **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.

**Identification of Stakeholders:** The school identifies key stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students (for secondary schools), families, and business or community leaders.

**Stakeholder Meetings:** The school organizes regular meetings involving the school leadership team, teachers, and staff. Student Focus Groups were held in the Fall and Spring of last school year to get a pulse on how the students were viewing the culture, climate, and academics of the school. Staff participated in a Direction, Alignment, and Commitment Professional Learning opportunity. Additionally, meetings with parents, students, families, and community leaders are scheduled.

**Data Sharing and Analysis:** During meetings, relevant data such as student performance, assessment results, and demographic information are shared. Stakeholders are presented with an overview of the current state of achievement, including areas of concern and achievement gaps.

**Input Collection:** Stakeholders are encouraged to provide input on SIP development. They share their insights, concerns, and suggestions for strategies that could improve student achievement and close gaps.

**Collaborative Strategy Development:** Based on stakeholder input and data analysis, the school leadership team works collaboratively to develop the SIP. The strategies outlined in the plan are informed by the collective expertise of teachers, staff, parents, students, and community members.

**Feedback and Refinement:** The initial draft of the SIP is shared with stakeholders for feedback. This feedback is considered and incorporated into the plan where appropriate. This collaborative process ensures that the plan reflects the needs and perspectives of all stakeholders.

**Alignment with Goals:** Stakeholder input helps ensure that the SIP's goals and strategies align with the school community's vision for improved student achievement and a reduced achievement gap.

**Communication:** The finalized SIP is communicated back to stakeholders. They are informed about the specific strategies, timeline, and expected outcomes.

### **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))

**Regular Monitoring:**

**Data Collection:** The school will regularly collect a variety of data, including student achievement data, attendance records, behavior reports, and assessment results. This data will be disaggregated by different student subgroups, such as race, socioeconomic status, English language proficiency, and special education status.

**Data Analysis:** The collected data will be analyzed to identify trends, patterns, and areas where students are not meeting academic standards. This analysis will pinpoint which subgroups are facing the greatest achievement gaps.

**Progress Tracking:** The school will track the progress of individual students and student subgroups over time. This will involve comparing current performance to baseline data and setting milestones for improvement.

**Stakeholder Involvement:** Teachers, administrators, parents, and community members will be involved in the monitoring process. Regular meetings and discussions will be held to review data, assess progress, and identify challenges.

**Revision Plan:**

**Continuous Improvement Cycle:** The school will establish a feedback loop where data analysis and impact assessment results inform ongoing improvement efforts. This cycle ensures that the plan remains dynamic and responsive to changing needs.

**Identifying Needs:** Through regular monitoring and assessment, the school will identify areas of the SIP that need revision. This might include tweaking strategies, setting new goals, or targeting different student subgroups that need additional support.

**Collaborative Decision-Making:** The school's leadership team, along with teachers and stakeholders, will collaborate to revise the plan. This process will involve discussing the data, sharing insights, and collectively deciding on the adjustments needed to enhance effectiveness.

**Documentation:** Revisions made to the SIP will be well-documented, including the rationale behind each change. This documentation will help maintain transparency and accountability in the improvement process.

<b>Demographic Data</b>	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	77%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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) White Students (WHT)



	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<p align="center"><b>School Grades History</b></p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: C
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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*	34	35	50	40	39	51	42		
ELA Learning Gains				38			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			44		
Math Achievement*	23	22	38	30	33	38	43		
Math Learning Gains				41			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			32		
Science Achievement*	62	56	64	60	28	40	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	62	66	68	36	48	76		
Middle School Acceleration					51	44			
Graduation Rate	84	86	89	93	59	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	72	64	65	68	62	67	77		
ELP Progress	32	37	45	36			63		

\* 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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	376
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	84

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	93

**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	38	Yes	4	
ELL	36	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	50			

**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	34			23			62	69		84	72	32
SWD	16			26			40	32		36	6	
ELL	14			14			20	27		74	7	32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			10			56	55		50	6	
HSP	33			22			62	69		70	7	35

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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41			27			66	70		78	6	
FRL	29			22			56	66		72	7	33

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	40	38	35	30	41	51	60	68		93	68	36
SWD	17	29	31	16	35		24	48		88	31	
ELL	8	30	38	28	38		51	28		92	42	36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	57		27			50	42				
HSP	37	40	40	30	44	54	58	66		92	69	39
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46	30	13	30	27		64	75		94	68	
FRL	35	38	33	27	42	59	57	66		93	65	38

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	48	44	43	42	32	69	76		93	77	63
SWD	18	23	19	24	26	25	30	43		89	37	
ELL	20	51	50	24	38	36	40	43		84	63	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	32		19	8					100	73	
HSP	38	48	43	43	44	35	64	75		93	77	62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	52	48	45	42	38	84	82		91	81	

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
FRL	38	49	43	41	42	28	63	69		93	77	69

**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
10	2023 - Spring	33%	37%	-4%	50%	-17%
09	2023 - Spring	37%	40%	-3%	48%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	32%	-4%	50%	-22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	22%	-1%	48%	-27%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	46%	13%	63%	-4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	63%	3%

### 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.**

The data component showing the lowest performance is Math with a 24% achievement rate. The contributing factors to last year's low performance is related to high teacher turnover and challenges with implementing Standards Based Planning.

1. High Teacher Turnover: High teacher turnover can have a significant impact on student performance, particularly in subjects like Math. Approximately 50% of last year's Math teacher were new. New teachers need time to acclimate to the curriculum and teaching methods. Disruptions in continuity of instruction resulted in gaps in student learning and inconsistency in instructional quality.

2. Standards Based Planning: With the high percentage of new teachers and a new curriculum, there were challenges in effectively implementing Standards Based Planning in the Math. Teachers needed clarification on aligning their teaching strategies with specific learning standards, ensuring that students are progressing as expected.

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

The Math data component showed the greatest decline, dropping from 30% to 24%. The contributing factors of high teacher turnover and challenges with implementing Standards Based Planning played a significant role in this decline.

1. High Teacher Turnover: High teacher turnover can have a profound impact on student learning, especially in a subject like Math. New teachers need time to familiarize themselves with the curriculum, teaching methodologies, and the needs of the students. This transition period can lead to disruptions in the continuity of instruction, resulting in gaps in student understanding and performance decline.

2. Standards Based Planning: Standards Based Planning is crucial for aligning teaching strategies with specific learning objectives and standards. If the implementation of this approach was inconsistent or not effectively integrated into the Math curriculum, students might not have received the necessary targeted instruction to meet the standards. This lack of alignment could have contributed to the decline in Math performance.

**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.**

Math saw the greatest gap as compared to the state average. Math was 28% below the state average. The following factors contributed to the gap.

1. High Teacher Turnover: Math department had a high-turnover with 50% of the teaching staff being first year teachers. High teacher turnover can have a profound impact on student learning, especially in a subject like Math. New teachers need time to familiarize themselves with the curriculum, teaching methodologies, and the needs of the students. This transition period can lead to disruptions in the continuity of instruction, resulting in gaps in student understanding and performance decline.

2. Effective Use of Curriculum: The Math curriculum was new for the 2022-2023 school year. Introducing

a new math curriculum can lead to an initial adjustment period for both teachers and students. Teachers may need time to adapt their teaching methods to align with the new curriculum's objectives, and students might need time to adjust to new learning approaches and content.

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

There wasn't particular area that showed the most improvement. However, Science and US History achievement rates have been maintained. Effective use of data-driven instruction and Standards Based Planning due to low teacher turnover and experienced teachers helped in these areas.

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

No data is available at this time

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

1. Math
2. ELA
3. Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities and ELL

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****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.

2022-2023 Proficiency and learning gains decreased in Math as compared to 2021-2022. Math achievement decreased from 30% to 24%. ELL and SWD subgroups saw the lowest achievement percentage. Math saw the biggest decline from previous year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, Math proficiency will increase from 34% to 40% as measured by the state EOC administered in May 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

Quarterly progress monitoring and tracking of standards proficiency through common assessments and data chats. The administrative team will have quarterly data chats with teachers in tested areas and additionally training will be provided as necessary. Teachers will have monthly data chats with students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristen Walker (walkerk@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.)

Standards Based Planning: Continued focused on Standards Based Planning aligning curriculum and instruction with specific learning objectives.

Data-Driven Decision Making: Implement common assessments across all grade levels. Utilize common planning to conduct data chats.

AVID Implementation School Wide: Implement WICOR strategies across content areas to build strong reading comprehension skills and strategies for understanding complex texts.

ELL and SWD Targeted Support: Paraprofessional push-in to work directly with ELL and SWD students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Standards Based Planning: Effective implementation of Standards Based Planning is crucial for aligning curriculum and instruction with learning standards. If this approach was not effectively integrated into the Math curriculum, students might not have received targeted instruction to meet the standards. Misalignment between instruction and standards can lead to confusion and hinder student progress.

Data-Driven Decision Making: Regularly analyzing student performance data allows educators to make informed instructional decisions and track progress.

AVID: Provide academic support and develop skills that enable students to succeed in rigorous coursework. Applying WICOR strategies across content areas will build strong reading comprehension skills and strategies for understanding complex texts.

ELL Targeted Support: ELL students often require targeted instruction and support to develop their



English language skills and succeed academically. Having a dedicated paraprofessional who are trained in English language acquisition and culturally responsive teaching ensures that these students receive the individualized attention they need.

SWD Targeted Support: Students with disabilities often have unique learning needs. The paraprofessional can work closely with the classroom teacher to understand the specific challenges and strengths of the student and tailor instructional strategies accordingly. This individualized support can enhance the student's learning experience and outcomes.

**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.

PLCS - Teachers collaborate within professional learning communities to share successful instructional strategies and resources related to Standards-Based Planning, and Data driven instruction

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Walker (walker@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** Common PLCs occur monthly

PDs to improve practice. This includes understanding how to analyze standards, design aligned instruction, create effective assessments, and incorporate WICOR strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Justin Helm (helmj@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** PDs occur monthly

Monitoring and Feedback:

Classroom walkthroughs aligned to AVID

Coaching Cycle

Admin review of Lesson Plans

Admin data chats with teachers

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Walker (walker@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** Weekly - Classroom walkthroughs aligned to AVID Monthly - Coaching Cycle Weekly - Admin review of Lesson Plans Quarterly - Admin data chats with teachers

## #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.

2022-2023 Proficiency and learning gains decreased in ELA as compared to 2021-2022. ELA achievement decreased from 40% to 30%. ELL and SWD subgroups saw the lowest achievement percentage. ELA proficiency is critical to students' success in other academic areas and thus, improvement in this content area is critical.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, Math proficiency will increase from 34% to 40% as measured by the state F.A.S.T. PM3 administered in May 2024.

### Monitoring:

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

Quarterly progress monitoring and tracking of standards proficiency through common assessments and data chats. The administrative team will have quarterly data chats with teachers in tested areas and additionally training will be provided as necessary. Teachers will have monthly data chats with students.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Bass (basst@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.)

Standards Based Planning: Continued focused on Standards Based Planning aligning curriculum and instruction with specific learning objectives.

Data-Driven Decision Making: Implement common assessments across all grade levels. Utilize common planning to conduct data chats.

AVID Implementation School Wide: Implement WICOR strategies across content areas to build strong reading comprehension skills and strategies for understanding complex texts.

ELL Targeted Support: Dedicated full-time ESOL Teacher

ELL and SWD Targeted Support: Paraprofessional push-in to work directly with ELL and SWD students.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Standards Based Planning: Effective implementation of Standards Based Planning is crucial for aligning curriculum and instruction with learning standards. If this approach was not effectively integrated into the ELA curriculum, students might not have received targeted instruction to meet the standards.

Misalignment between instruction and standards can lead to confusion and hinder student progress.

Data-Driven Decision Making: Regularly analyzing student performance data allows educators to make informed instructional decisions and track progress.

AVID: Provide academic support and develop skills that enable students to succeed in rigorous coursework. Applying WICOR strategies across content areas will build strong reading comprehension

skills and strategies for understanding complex texts.

ELL Targeted Support: ELL students often require targeted instruction and support to develop their English language skills and succeed academically. Having a dedicated ELL teacher and paraprofessional who are trained in English language acquisition and culturally responsive teaching ensures that these students receive the individualized attention they need.

SWD Targeted Support: Students with disabilities often have unique learning needs. The paraprofessional can work closely with the classroom teacher to understand the specific challenges and strengths of the student and tailor instructional strategies accordingly. This individualized support can enhance the student's learning experience and outcomes.

### **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.

PLCS - Teachers collaborate within professional learning communities to share successful instructional strategies and resources related to Standards-Based Planning, and Data driven instruction

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Bass (basst@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** Monthly

PDs to improve practice. This includes understanding how to analyze standards, design aligned instruction, create effective assessments, and incorporate WICOR strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Justin Helm (helmj@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** Monthly

Monitoring and Feedback:

Classroom walkthroughs aligned to AVID

Coaching Cycle

Admin review of Lesson Plans

Admin data chats with teachers

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Bass (basst@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** Weekly - Classroom walkthroughs aligned to AVID Monthly - Coaching Cycle Weekly - Admin review of Lesson Plans Quarterly - Admin data chats with teachers

### #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.

LaBelle High School is focused on teacher retention which is essential for maintaining instructional continuity, improving student outcomes, and cultivating a strong educational community. Both ELA and Math had a high turnover rate with approximately 50% of staff being new teachers in each content area. High turnover can disrupt the continuity of instruction. Disruptions in continuity of instruction resulted in gaps in student learning and inconsistency in instructional quality.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year decrease teacher turnover by 20% resulting a more stable and experienced teaching workforce.

#### Monitoring:

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

Feedback Channels: Teachers are provided with opportunities for feedback and input through meetings, surveys, and coaching cycles.

Based on the identified gaps, implement evidence-based interventions and strategies to address challenges and enhance the work environment. These interventions could include targeted professional development, improved communication protocols, mentorship programs, or wellness initiatives.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Bass (basst@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.)

Targeted On-Boarding for New Teachers  
Instructional Coaching Cycles  
AVID School Wide:

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted Site Based On-Boarding for New Teachers: The onboarding process for new teachers is an evidence-based intervention aimed at facilitating a smooth transition for new educators into the school community, fostering a positive culture and climate, and ultimately contributing to teacher retention. The onboarding process is designed to provide targeted instruction based on needs of Career Changers, New Educators, and Transitioning Educators. It encompasses a structured series of activities and supports designed to help new teachers acclimate to their roles, build meaningful relationships, understand the school's culture, and access the resources they need for success.

Instructional Coaching Cycle: This intervention involves a structured process in which instructional coaches collaborate with teachers to identify goals, observe classroom instruction, provide feedback, and support ongoing improvement. It is designed to enhance teacher professional growth, instructional practices, and ultimately contribute to a positive culture and climate within educational institutions.

AVID School Wide: The professional development and collaboration associated with AVID foster a sense of shared purpose and community among educators, enhancing the overall school culture. In addition, it

addresses both academic and socio-emotional needs, contributing to a positive school culture that supports student growth and well-being.

**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.

On-Boarding PD for New Teachers

**Person Responsible:** Michele Brown (brownm@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** 2x a Month starting August 2023

Identify teacher for Instructional Coaching Cycles

Begin Cycles

Reevaluate

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Bass (basst@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** August 2023 Review monthly

AVID Focus

AVID PD

**Person Responsible:** David Tippet (tippetd@hendry-schools.net)

**By When:** Quarterly - AVID Focus Monthly - AVID PDs