
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Hubert O. Sibley K 8 Academy

255 NW 115TH ST, Miami, FL 33168

<http://hubertosibley.dadeschools.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to build together collaboratively by providing a variety of high-quality experiences for students, and to promote academic, social and developmental needs for all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A community where all children feel loved, respected, and encouraged to develop to their fullest potential.

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
Larkin, Chandrell	Principal	
Bryant, Angelica	Assistant Principal	Through coordination with principals they enforce a school's policies and help set goals and objectives for both instruction and extracurricular activities.
Salgan, Jacqueline	Instructional Coach	Provide coaching and other professional development support that enables teachers to think reflectively about improving student learning and implementing various instructional programs and practices.
Gaviria, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for teaching students based on national curriculum guidelines within their specialist subject areas.
Brailsford, Sade	Magnet Coordinator	Provides instructional leadership in the design, development, and implementation of the unique magnet curriculum; teaches some portion of the course offerings in the program and/or provides demonstration teaching for the magnet program/school staff.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

The stakeholders involved in building the SIP are the Principal, Mrs. Larkin, Assistant Principal, Ms. Bryant, Instructional Coach, Mrs. Salgan, Magnet lead teacher, Ms. Brailsford, Teacher Leaders and our Counselor, Ms. Burden. The School Advisory Council meets monthly to review and provide input in developing the School Improvement Plan. The Principal’s role is to monitor and oversee all the school’s initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning team-building and morale boosting activities. The Assistant Principal will monitor other programs and assist in ensuring all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Instructional coach assists in providing support to teachers and providing mentorship. Teacher leaders and counselors, provide student support.

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 Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, teachers will adjust groups based on current data in real-time, and administration will follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is taking place. The Leadership Team will also meet for the beginning of year and midyear review to discuss action if action steps have been implemented with fidelity.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2020-21: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	12	6	3	8	8	4	13	8	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	12	16	11	5	3	0	2	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	6	4	9	7	3	7	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	19	20	30	30	24	135
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	18	23	40	30	23	139
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	19	32	24	21	49	56	44	259

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	7	14	16	18	26	22	20	123

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	1	12	0	1	0	1	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4

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	7	9	10	5	7	11	27	31	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	58	38	108
Course failure in ELA	0	7	16	15	9	6	11	21	29	114
Course failure in Math	0	5	11	7	6	4	12	0	7	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	14	19	46	33	54	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	21	20	48	66	48	215
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	18	26	14	24	45	26	42	201

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	7	10	16	17	18	44	58	59	229

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	6	15	2	2	6	1	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	3	1	14

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	7	9	10	5	7	11	27	31	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	58	38	108
Course failure in ELA	0	7	16	15	9	6	11	21	29	114
Course failure in Math	0	5	11	7	6	4	12	0	7	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	14	19	46	33	54	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	21	20	48	66	48	215
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	18	26	14	24	45	26	42	201

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	7	10	16	17	18	44	58	59	229

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	6	15	2	2	6	1	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	3	1	14

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	40			31			35		
ELA Learning Gains	57			49			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56			49			52		
Math Achievement*	32			18			35		
Math Learning Gains	59			31			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60			37			47		
Science Achievement*	40			25			32		
Social Studies Achievement*	57			40			44		
Middle School Acceleration	82			60			87		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	45			35			50		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	54			

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)

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	57	56	32	59	60	40	57	82			45
SWD	17	42		9	39							
ELL	34	52	47	25	67	72	36	52				45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	57	55	31	57	59	38	56	77			49
HSP	48	58		40	66	73	50	64				37
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	40	58	58	32	58	60	39	61	82			47

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	31	49	49	18	31	37	25	40	60			35
SWD	17	36	33	17	19	9	22					
ELL	33	58	71	19	39	46	24	41				35
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	47	43	17	29	36	23	40	63			32
HSP	34	59		23	35		38	45				42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	31	48	48	18	30	38	25	40	60			35

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	35	48	52	35	51	47	32	44	87			50
SWD	19	46	54	32	48	29	20					
ELL	29	50	49	33	52	55	27	38				50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	47	49	34	49	47	32	46	85			49
HSP	36	52	64	38	58	40	29	36				55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35	48	51	34	51	47	31	45	85			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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

As per our 2022-2023 data, our 8th grade science scores showed the lowest performance at 10% proficiency. When analyzing our 8th grade student data, overall they performed low in reading and math as well. We believe the low performance is due to lack of foundational skills which we will be addressing this year.

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

As per our 2022-2023 data, our 8th grade science scores declined 21 percentage points from 31% in 2021-2022 to 10% in 2022-2023. Our Algebra EOC declined 31 percentage points from 92% in 2021-2022 to 61% in 2022-2023. We believe the low performance for science is based on lack of foundational skills which we will be addressing this year. We will also need to address and provide additional opportunities for students taking Algebra 1 to help students increase skills.

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.

As per our 2022-2023 data 8th grade math showed a 33% gap between the state average of 55% and our proficiency of 22%. 8th grade science showed a 34% gap between the state average of 44% and our proficiency of 10%. Our Civics data showed a 20% gap between the state average and our proficiency of 47%. We noticed that our eight grade students lacked foundational skills and we will be addressing that this year with our incoming eight grade students. We will begin tutoring in Sept. 2023, and we will incorporate more science labs into the curriculum to provide students with hands on learning to increase our science scores.

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

As per our 2022-2023 data there were several areas we improved in significantly. 4th grade ELA improved 30 percentage points from 33% to 63%. 6th grade ELA improved 23 percentage points from 37% to 60%. 3rd grade Math improved 22 percentage points from 35% to 57%, 6th grade Math improved 30 percentage points from 17% to 47%. Students were given extensive opportunities for remediation and enrichment with data based differentiated instruction and intensive intervention in both ELA and Math.

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

We are increasing our attention on providing explicit intervention for our middle school students. We will also provide additional support for teachers including data analysis and differentiated instruction guidance. We will offer additional tutoring programs to reinforce foundation skills which will in turn increase overall student proficiency.

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

Hubert O. Sibley K-8 Academy is dedicated to improving student performance in the area of Science, Civics, and Algebra. This year our goal is to increase opportunities for remediation and enrichment

earlier in the school year. We will begin tutoring in Sept. 2023, and we will incorporate more science labs into the curriculum to provide students with hands on learning to increase our science scores.

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 Science**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.

According to the 2022-2023 NGSS data, our 8th grade science scores declined 21 percentage points from 31% in 2021-2022 to 10% in 2022-2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement Project Based Learning consistently students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points in Science proficiency, as evidenced by end of year NGSS assessments.

Monitoring:

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

A comprehensive lab schedule will be created and monitored by the Leadership Team to ensure teachers are implementing Project Based Learning lessons aligned to curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angelica Bryant (289157@dadeschools.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.)

Collaborative Learning/Structures: Collaborative learning is based on the theory that knowledge is a social construct. Collaborative activities are most often based on four principles: (1) the learner or student is the primary focus of instruction; (2) interaction and "doing" are of primary importance; (3) working in groups is an important mode of learning; (4) structured approaches to developing solutions to real-world problems should be incorporated into learning. Collaborative learning can occur peer-to-peer or in larger groups. Peer teaching/learning is a type of collaborative learning that involves students working in pairs or small groups to discuss concepts, or find solutions to problems. It enables learners to take responsibility for reviewing, organizing, and consolidating existing knowledge and material; understanding its basic structure; filling in the gaps; finding additional meanings; and reformulating knowledge into new conceptual frameworks. Learning from peers increases learning both for the students being helped as well as for those giving the help.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the 2022-2023 NGSS data, 10% of our 8th grade students were proficient in Science as compared to the state average of 44% and district average 40%. Based on data and the identified contributing factors of limited foundational skills in Science, absence of Science teacher during the first nine week grading period, and lack of Project Based Learning. We will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Learning/Structures.

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.

08/14-09/29/2023 The Magnet Lead Teacher will meet with grade levels weekly to dissect standards and plan for Science labs.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.net)

08/14-09/29/2023 The Magnet Lead Teacher will meet with grade levels to assist teachers in gathering resources needed to implement Science labs.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.net)

08/14/-09/29/2023 Magnet lead teacher will review artifacts in collaborative planning to ensure alignment with standards and project based learning labs are being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

Based on our 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. scores 12% of our SWD students were proficient in ELA and 15% were proficient in Math. We selected the overarching area of Data Driven Instruction based on our findings. We are not meeting the unique needs of all learners therefore it is evident that we must improve our ability to differentiate instruction using data based on the levels of the students we serve. We will provide the scaffolding necessary for all students to access grade-level content in order to move towards proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement Differentiated Instruction consistently, then ESE students will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points in ELA achievement level, and 5 percentage points in Math as evidenced by 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. results.

Monitoring:

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

The Instructional coach will meet weekly with the ESE teacher to analyze data and assist with materials. Administration will follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is taking place.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.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.)

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Instruction with a focus on ELA and Math data, this will enable teachers to provide meaningful instruction geared to the various needs of their students. Targeted instruction on ELA and Math standards utilizing student data and progress monitoring of students not on track to score level 3 or above will enable teachers to instruct students, plan for D.I. for deficient standards, and provide the interventions needed for all learners.

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.

08-14-9/29/23 The Instructional Coach will meet with teacher to dissect F.A.S.T. PM1 and group students accordingly.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.net)

08-14-9/29/23 Instructional Coach will meet with the teacher each week to collaborate on reading instructional frameworks, pacing guides, toolbox materials, and best practices in curriculum.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.net)

The Instructional Coach will meet with teacher to dissect standards using the bi-weekly assessment and decide instructional material that will be utilized for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

According to the 2022-2023 SIP climate survey 57% of teachers felt that there is a lack of parental concern in our school. This is a 49% increase from our 2021-2022 survey.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully complete the evidenced based strategy of family engagement we will increase parental participation in school-wide activities throughout the year.

Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor parental and family engagement, administration will track participation using sign in event sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angelica Bryant (289157@dadeschools.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.)

Family Engagement studies show that parent involvement is a major factor in student outcomes, including closing the achievement gap between various groups of students. Different families have different capacities for involvement, meaning schools should provide a range of ways for parents to be involved. Examples of Family Engagement activities include, but are not limited to, open houses, orientations, parent workshops, home visits, volunteer opportunities, and community events. The most important elements of a Family Engagement program are (1) creating genuine and collaborative relationships with families, (2) creating interactive sessions between staff and families, and (3) linking all interactions to learning to help build families' capacities in supporting their students' academic growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the 2022-2023 SIP climate survey 57% of teachers felt that there is a lack of parental concern in our school.

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.

08/14-09/29/2023 We will continue to keep parents informed this year by conducting monthly Coffee Breaks with Principal Larkin.

Person Responsible: Chandrell Larkin (pr5141@dadeschools.net)

08/14-09/29/2023 Our CIS Ms. Francois will host informational parent meetings (topics to be determined) every month to increase family engagement and support parents with student academic assistance.

Person Responsible: Angelica Bryant (289157@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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.

Based on our 2022-2023 data, our 7th grade Civics scores decreased by 10 percentage points from 57% in 2021-2022 to 47% in 2022-2023, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Standards-aligned instruction. Hubert O. Sibley K-8 Academy will strive to utilize standards to plan and engage students, we will continue to use data to drive our instruction and create engaging lessons to increase proficiency. If we continue to collaboratively plan using the Civics standards, then we will have more students scoring at proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement Standards-aligned instruction consistently students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points in proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

The Administrative Team will monitor lesson plans and observe instruction during walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angelica Bryant (289157@dadeschools.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-Aligned Instruction refers to teachers executing lessons based on the standards/learning targets and ensure that all student products and teaching techniques are aligned to the intended standards. Teachers will deliver planned lessons to guide students through the demands of the standards/learning targets. Students will show evidence of mastering the lesson objective/s through their work samples/tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Standard-Based Planning improves collaboration and assures all teachers are teaching the standards. Planning will assist teachers in utilizing best practices when implementing lessons based on the standards/learning targets and ensure that all students are receiving the grade level content and skills they need.

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.

08/14-09/29/2023 The Instructional Coach will meet with grade levels weekly to dissect standards and provide resources to master learning targets.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.net)

08/14-09/29/2023 Instructional Coach will review artifacts in collaborative planning to ensure alignment with standards.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.net)

08/14-09/29/2023 Instructional Coach will meet in collaborative planning to dissect data from mini assessments and plan for further instruction.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Salgan (jsalgan@dadeschools.net)

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).

In an effort to improve student outcomes at the school site we will offer educational services (Such as extended learning opportunities, summer services, before or after school tutorials, winter and spring recess tutorial sessions, etc.)

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our school will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiation based on the percentage of students who are not on track to score level 3 or above on the statewide standardized assessment. We are not meeting the unique needs of all learners therefore it is evident that we must improve our ability to differentiate instruction based on the levels of the students we serve. We will provide the scaffolding necessary for all students to access grade-level content in order to move towards proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Our school will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiation based on the percentage of students below level 3 on 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. assessment 3rd grade had 47% of students below level 3, fourth

grade had 37% of students below level 3, and 5th grade had 52% of students below level 3. We are not meeting the unique needs of all learners therefore it is evident that we must improve our ability to differentiate instruction based on the levels of the students we serve. We will provide the scaffolding necessary for all students to access grade-level content in order to move towards proficiency.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

If we successfully implement Differentiated Instruction consistently, then students in K-2 will increase a minimum of 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 state assessments

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we successfully implement Differentiated Instruction consistently, then students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points in Reading, as evidenced by the 2024 State Assessments.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, teachers will adjust groups based on current data in real time, and administration will follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is taking place

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bryant, Angelica, abryant@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Differentiated Instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons and differentiate instruction based on student needs. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instruction, plans, and instructional delivery as new data becomes available.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
08/14-09/29/2023 The Instructional Coach will meet with grade levels to dissect F.A.S.T. PM1 data and group students accordingly. We will also analyze data after i-Ready AP1 and all bi-weekly assessments.	Salgan, Jacqueline, jsalgan@dadeschools.net
08/14-09/29/2023 The Instructional Coach will meet with grade levels each week to collaborate on ELA instructional frameworks, pacing guides, toolbox materials, and best practices in curriculum.	Salgan, Jacqueline, jsalgan@dadeschools.net
08/14-09/29/2023 The Instructional Coach will plan and coordinate professional development with our assigned State Regional Literacy Director. (SRLDs).	Salgan, Jacqueline, jsalgan@dadeschools.net

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.

Hubertosibley.org
 The School Improvement Plan is shared during Faculty meetings, Curriculum Council meetings, and EESAC meetings. All stakeholders have an opportunity to review the plan.

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))

Hubertosibley.org
 Hubert O. Sibley will focus on the evidenced based strategy of family engagement which will increase parental participation in school-wide activities throughout the year. Mrs. Larkin will hold monthly Coffee breaks via zoom to connect with parents and update them on upcoming events. Ms. Francois will also hold informational parent meetings topics based on parental needs. Hubert O. Sibley will host PM3 F.A.S.T. night to educate parents on upcoming testing.

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

Hubert O. Sibley will strengthen the academic program in our school by focusing on Standard Based Planning during collaborative planning. Standard-Based Planning improves collaboration and assures all

teachers are teaching the standards. Planning will assist teachers in utilizing best practices when implementing lessons based on the standards/learning targets and ensure that all students are receiving the grade level content and skills they need.

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))

In an effort to improve student outcomes at the school site we will offer educational services (Such as extended learning opportunities, summer services, before or after school tutorials, winter and spring recess tutorial sessions, etc.)

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Hubert O. Sibley counselors work with students individually to help them develop strategies to improve student wellness. Counselors provide whole classroom lessons on anti-bullying.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Hubert o. Sibley offers accelerated courses to our secondary students. We offer Algebra 1, Geometry, Biology, and Physical Science. These courses will allow students to earn postsecondary credit in high school.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Hubert O. Sibley has implemented a school-wide discipline plan to address problem behaviors. Teachers are to contact parents first to address any discipline problems. If a problem persists teachers write a referral to send to administration. Administration will take the appropriate action based on the offense and the Student Code of Conduct.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Hubert O. Sibley provides professional learning opportunities to improve instruction and use of data on Professional Development days. We also focus on data driven instruction during collaborative planning. Teachers dissect assessments and plan for differentiated instruction.

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

Hubert O. Sibley hosts a program called Kinder Rocks, which allows parents of preschool students access to information about the kindergarten programs and teachers at Hubert O. Sibley. Also, our Magnet Lead teacher visits preschools in the area and talks about our kindergarten program.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes