

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Liberty 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	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Liberty Middle School

17400 COMMERCE PARK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

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.

Liberty Middle School's mission is to provide a safe, caring, yet Motivating, learning environment. The faculty and staff are dedicated to the task of assisting students with achieving Academic excellence through Rigorous and challenging learning curriculum. Through these means we will ensure that students are College-ready and have the necessary skills to be successful citizens, ultimately reaching their Highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

M.A.R.C.H. with P.R.I.D.E
(Mission) with Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Dependability, Encouragement

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
Diaz, Frank	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures academic policies and curriculum are followed • Develops and tracks benchmarks for measuring institutional success • Helps promote leadership opportunities amongst faculty and staff • Addresses concerns of stakeholders • Meets with parents and administrators on a regular basis for problem resolution • Enforces discipline when necessary • Provides an atmosphere free of any bias in which students can achieve their maximum potential
Manuel, Liza	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the master schedule and all curriculum issues • Oversees staff development training and points • FTE Coordinator • Oversees the guidance department • Oversees the ESE Department • Oversees the ESOL program • Monitors benchmark progress of students • Oversees all testing • Articulation and orientation with feeder schools • Oversees the registration process (address verification) • Oversees office assistants • Oversees substitute and class coverage. Oversees substitutes folders and surveys • Oversees Extended Learning Program and morning tutorial
	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversees attendance process • Responsible for keys • Publishing of bell schedules • Ordering of equipment/supplies/furniture/paper • Supervision and duty roster coordinator • Oversees athletics • Oversees the custodial personnel • Responsible for maintenance of building and grounds • Crisis Plan Coordinator and for the school (drills for fire, emergencies, severe weather, etc.) • Booking of Freedom auditorium • Use of Liberty by outside agencies • Energy Conservation coordinator • Oversees yearbook process • Oversees all fundraiser activities and forms • Oversees schoolwide committees • Safety Coordinator • Responsible for lockers • Responsible for field trips • Health Coordinator (shots and screening) • Bus Coordinator • Oversees picture process • Oversees registration process (address verification)

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the textbook coordinator for school (Coordinates with subject area leaders the ordering, dissemination and inventory of textbooks)
Escobar, Jennifer		Oversees the ESE program and documentation process.
Gresham, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader: Social Studies
Boghosian, Megan	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair
Emmons, Jennifer	School Counselor	7th grade counselor
Perez, FrancesL		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversees attendance process • Responsible for keys • Publishing of bell schedules • Ordering of equipment/supplies/furniture/paper • Supervision and duty roster coordinator • Oversees athletics • Oversees the custodial personnel • Responsible for maintenance of building and grounds • Crisis Plan Coordinator and for the school (drills for fire, emergencies, severe weather, etc.) • Booking of Freedom auditorium • Use of Liberty by outside agencies • Energy Conservation coordinator • Oversees yearbook process • Oversees all fundraiser activities and forms • Oversees schoolwide committees • Safety Coordinator • Responsible for lockers • Responsible for field trips • Health Coordinator (shots and screening)
Stabile, Susan	School Counselor	6th grade counselor
Sutton, Natalia	Teacher, K-12	PBIS Coordinator
Karlen, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader, Math
Cadet, Edwin	Behavior Specialist	Monitors PBIS Systems, Creates Individual Behavior Plans
Novello, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader: Literacy

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.

Stakeholders were provided the 22-23 Assessment Data which was then analyzed during leadership, department and grade level meetings. Subject area leaders reflected on data within their departments, focusing on overall scores as well as grade level results. Analysis results were shared back to leadership and the SIP team with strengths and weaknesses highlighted along with focus points for the current school year.

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))

Our SIP will be regularly monitored by school leadership for its effective implementation and impact on increased student achievement throughout the year during leadership meetings (i.e. ILT meetings) with a deep evaluation following Progress Monitoring assessments.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	63	80	100	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	77	92	179
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	92	4	195
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	39	5	110
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	33	33	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	27	20	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	33	57
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	33	69	94	196

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	2	0	4	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	59	115	99	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	86	75	170
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	94	82	231
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	69	61	189
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	48	42	96

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	7	4	1	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	59	115	99	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	86	75	170
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	94	82	231
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	69	61	189
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	48	42	96

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	7	4	1	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	54	49	49	54	50	50	54		
ELA Learning Gains				55			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			29		
Math Achievement*	67	57	56	59	36	36	56		
Math Learning Gains				62			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			37		
Science Achievement*	52	44	49	49	52	53	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	66	68	76	58	58	63		
Middle School Acceleration	91	84	73	85	51	49	81		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	48	39	40	42	86	76	24		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	586
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	51			
HSP	56			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	78			

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	50			

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	43			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	46			
HSP	52			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	70			
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	54			67			52	71	91			48
SWD	26			35			12	53			4	
ELL	32			56			24	60	90		6	46
AMI												
ASN	80			92			83	89	97		5	
BLK	42			51			31	52	79		5	
HSP	41			59			35	73	80		6	46
MUL	66			74			61	85	93		5	

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	65			77			70	83	95		5	
FRL	37			50			32	56	80		6	44

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	54	55	51	59	62	53	49	76	85			42
SWD	23	50	47	30	47	44	27	53	67			
ELL	32	53	46	42	53	47	25	62	72			42
AMI												
ASN	87	78	62	90	87	67	87	92	98			
BLK	34	49	49	38	48	49	28	61	58			
HSP	45	52	51	51	56	48	33	68	78			39
MUL	58	59		68	76		55	79	92			
PAC												
WHT	71	55	52	74	65	67	74	82	91			
FRL	39	50	48	45	51	47	35	59	66			40

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	54	52	29	56	48	37	55	63	81			24
SWD	17	23	19	22	34	30	25	30	75			
ELL	33	42	32	40	41	31	29	54	64			24
AMI												
ASN	80	80	45	83	71		76	90	94			
BLK	33	34	19	33	35	35	38	47	58			
HSP	43	44	31	44	40	33	43	54	76			25
MUL	56	40		58	44	30	46	57	71			
PAC												
WHT	71	66	48	74	59	50	75	81	88			
FRL	35	38	26	39	41	36	37	51	63			24

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	47%	47%	0%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	44%	6%	47%	3%
06	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	47%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	47%	36%	11%	48%	-1%
08	2023 - Spring	69%	57%	12%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	41%	9%	44%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	55%	38%	50%	43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	62%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	64%	6%	66%	4%

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 science data showed the lowest performance. Student achievement decreased by 6%. Teacher retention, administrative changes and low student reading proficiency contributed to student performance. Out SWD population scored low on science assessments in part because of the reading deficiencies that are also present in this .

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

School wide science data showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Student achievement declined from 55% to 49%. One contributing factor that contributed to this decline in achievement was teacher retention. The 2022-2023 school year had several new teachers in the science department due to several previous staff members leaving Liberty. Liberty's ACP also changed midyear resulting in leadership style changes which also could have been a contributing factor.

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 math data, specifically 7gth grade accelerated and Pre-algebra, showed the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our school percentage of proficiency was 12% higher than the state average. Factors contributing to this data point were the math departments implementation of IXL, small group instruction and a high number of classes having co-teachers.

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

Our math data showed the most improvement, specifically in learning gains and in the Lowest 25th Percentile. Learning gains in math increased by 14% and our Lowest 25th Percentile increased by 26%. New actions taken by our math department were the implementation of daily needs based small group instruction along with increasing the number of co-teachers in math.

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

While reflecting on our EWS data two particular areas of concerns were identified. These areas are: Attendance absent 10% or more and Course Failure in ELA.

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

Three areas were identified as our school's highest priorities this school year:

1. Increased performance in our lowest performing subgroups.
2. Small group instruction provided for remediation and extension across all subject areas.
3. Decrease in out of school suspensions.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

We will continue to utilize the inquiry cycle of data-driven instruction to include assessment, data analysis and focused action to increase student learning as well as implementing literacy strategies across all content areas.

This Area of Focus was identified after reflecting particularly on our low increase in learning gains in ELA and the decline in our Science learning gains. Reflecting on what practices led to the increase in in our Math data and Social Studies also contributed to the formation of this Area of Focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will demonstrate increased literacy, content comprehension and application of subject matter on assessments during each learning cycle.

Monitoring:

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

Student assessment data will be used to drive instructional planning by teachers during weekly PLCs that are facilitated by and monitored by the Subject Area Leader. The Instructional Leadership team will monitor data from PLCs for trends and action steps needed. Literacy strategy selection, implementation and effectiveness will be monitored by SALs and the Instructional Leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.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.)

Common interim assessment data: monitors growth and achievement according to specific learning goals and academic standards.

Guided discourse: directs and guides the students in a classroom talk on a specific problem.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The effectiveness of collective teacher efficacy has been validated repeatedly by research involving general education and special education students. (John Hattie) Albert Bandura defines collective efficacy as "a group's shared belief in the conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment."

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.

Teachers will:

- administer and analyze common interim assessment data
- determine benchmarks needing additional action
- determine and implement literacy strategies
- Revisit targeted skills and concepts by engaging in guided discourse
- Reassess

Subject Area Leaders will:

- monitor common assessment decisions
- gather subject and grade level data analysis from teachers
- share data analysis with the Instructional Leadership Team
- share literacy strategies and provide implementation support to teachers

Person Responsible: Liza Manuel (liza.manuel@hcps.net)

By When: Student literacy and learning will be evaluated weekly during PLCs as well as at the end of each learning cycle determined during PLC planning.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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.

All students will be provided small group instruction opportunities, with a specific focus on underperforming subgroups, led by the classroom teacher(s). Students will also be provided with opportunities to engage in cooperative learning groups following whole class instruction to apply and reinforce literacy strategies as well as content concepts and skills.

The gains in our math data were influential in the formation of this Area of Focus. Small group instruction was implemented routinely within this department which contributed to the sizeable increase in overall student achievement, SWD gains and a significant increase in the lowest 25th percentile.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers will instruct small groups of specifically grouped students to increase student literacy and comprehension of instructional concepts.

Monitoring:

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

Student data will be shared in weekly meetings with SALs which include planning driven by student needs. Underperforming subgroups will be directly addressed during planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frank Diaz (frank.diaz@hcps.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.)

- Check for understanding
- Scaffolded and differentiated instruction
- Accelerate students to finish their learning
- Conduct data chats
- Present a targeted ask for evidence of learning or discover misconceptions

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Learning science research has shown that small-group learning (when compared to competitive and individualistic learning) improves academic achievement, relationships with classmates and faculty, and promotes psychological well-being. The following summarizes these benefits, drawn from a meta-analysis of small-group learning in The Journal on Excellence in College Teaching (Johnson et. al., 2014).

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.

Teachers will:

- Informally assess students during instruction
- Identify individual student needs for success
- Implement small group instruction based on individual needs with a specific focus on underperforming subgroups.
- Implement literacy strategies
- Collect and share student data during weekly PLCs

Subject Area Leaders will:

- Monitor student data provided by teachers
- Provide support for teachers regarding small group instruction and literacy strategies

Person Responsible: Liza Manuel (liza.manuel@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly during PLCs.

For all underperforming subgroups teachers will:

- Informally assess students during instruction
- Identify individual student needs for success
- Implement small group instruction based on individual needs with
- Collect and share student data during weekly PLCs

Person Responsible: Liza Manuel (liza.manuel@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly during PLCs

#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.

Liberty Middle School is a community that is committed to helping one another learn and grow. A school-wide incentive program is used by all staff which encourages and rewards students that follow these expectations:

As a Liberty Middle School student, I will embrace the core values of PRIDE.

- I will Persevere: I will do the hard work it takes to be successful.
- I will be Respectful: I will honor all people and their ideas.
- I will show Integrity: I will be trustworthy, honest, and kind.
- I will be Dependable: I will honor my commitments and be reliable.
- I will Encourage others: I will be caring, sympathetic, and helpful.

The need for a school-wide incentive program was identified as a need because currently 179 students have one or more suspensions in the previous school year. The use of this program also showed a marked decrease in suspensions in the previous school year as determined by quarterly analysis of out of school suspensions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

External suspensions will decline by 25%.

Monitoring:

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

Suspension data will be monitored on a quarterly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

FrancesL Perez (francesl.perez@hcps.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' positive referrals will increase which will allow students will be able to participate in Liberty Store, Eagle's Nest, and school-wide incentives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed. (<https://www.pbis.org/>)

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