The School District of Lee County

Cypress Lake Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Cypress Lake Middle School

8901 CYPRESS LAKE DR, Fort Myers, FL 33919

http://cym.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Miller Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

- 1. have a school grade of D or F
- 2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
- 3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Cypress Lake Middle School

8901 CYPRESS LAKE DR, Fort Myers, FL 33919

http://cym.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Gi (per MSID I		2020-21 Title I School	l Disadvan	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Middle Sch 6-8	nool	No		65%
Primary Servio (per MSID I	• •	Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		53%
School Grades Histo	ry			
Year Grade	2020-21	2019-20 A	2018-19 A	2017-18 A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The School District of Lee County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers. Cypress Lake Middle School's Mantra: Passion for Success: Academics, Arts, and Life

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Cypress Lake Middle School, we facilitate a safe environment where students have access to tools and opportunities to promote social and academic growth leading to success in the 21st Century.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Matt	Principal	Principal Oversee the hiring process Assign teaching duties to classroom teachers Assign duties to paraprofessionals Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity Oversee employee evaluation system Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process Manage school budgets Liaison between school and school district personnel as well as with the community
Cook, Michael	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Create master schedule and ensure proper course placement for students Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development Oversee the new teacher mentoring program (APPLES) Oversee school PBIS program Administrator over students last names L-Z Oversee matters of curriculum and instructional materials
Stirns, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member teacher are as follows: Provide leadership within their department Liaison between their department and administration Provide high-quality instruction to assigned students Monitor student learning progress via i-Ready, district exemplars, and classroom assessments both formative and summative Participate in professional development Deliver professional development Serve as a mentor for teachers within the department and/or new teachers outside the department Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Vidlund, Christine	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member teacher are as follows: • Provide leadership within their department • Liaison between their department and administration • Provide high-quality instruction to assigned students • Monitor student learning progress via i-Ready, district exemplars, and classroom assessments both formative and summative • Participate in professional development • Deliver professional development • Serve as a mentor for teachers within the department and/or new teachers outside the department

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		 Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Voyer, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member teacher are as follows: • Provide leadership within their department • Liaison between their department and administration • Provide high-quality instruction to assigned students • Monitor student learning progress via i-Ready, district exemplars, and classroom assessments both formative and summative • Participate in professional development • Deliver professional development • Serve as a mentor for teachers within the department and/or new teachers outside the department • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Williams, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member teacher are as follows: • Provide leadership within their department • Liaison between their department and administration • Provide high-quality instruction to assigned students • Monitor student learning progress via i-Ready, district exemplars, and classroom assessments both formative and summative • Participate in professional development • Deliver professional development • Serve as a mentor for teachers within the department and/or new teachers outside the department • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Lockard, Betty	School Counselor	School Counselor
Mills, Katie	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Patel, Suzi	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist
Bulanda, Pete	Teacher, K-12	Teacher and Intervention Support Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Matthew Miller

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

788

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator							Grad	le Le	vel					Total
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	227	275	286	0	0	0	0	788
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	40	46	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	22	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	1	2	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	1	2	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	60	48	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	61	53	0	0	0	0	161
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	60	49	0	0	0	0	157	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator							Grad	le Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	281	286	309	0	0	0	0	876
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	23	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	28	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	40	55	0	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	43	38	0	0	0	0	132

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

lasticator						(Grad	e Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	35	41	0	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level														
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator							Grad	de Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	281	286	309	0	0	0	0	876
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	23	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	28	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	40	55	0	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	43	38	0	0	0	0	132

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator		Grade Level											Total	
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	35	41	0	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component		2021			2019			2018	
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	55%	54%	67%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	54%	61%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	44%	47%	48%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				78%	64%	58%	75%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains				74%	64%	57%	72%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	54%	51%	54%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				74%	50%	51%	67%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				79%	70%	72%	85%	69%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

			ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	64%	52%	12%	54%	10%
Cohort Con	nparison					
07	2021					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	52%	-1%
Cohort Con	nparison	-64%				
08	2021					
	2019	74%	57%	17%	56%	18%
Cohort Con	nparison	-51%			•	

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	56%	47%	9%	55%	1%
Cohort Co	mparison					
07	2021					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	54%	15%
Cohort Co	mparison	-56%				
08	2021					
	2019	81%	60%	21%	46%	35%
Cohort Co	mparison	-69%				

SCIENCE									
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison			
08	2021								
	2019	72%	46%	26%	48%	24%			
Cohort Com	nparison								

	BIOLOGY EOC									
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State					
2021										
2019	0%	56%	-56%	67%	-67%					
		CIVIC	S EOC							
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State					
2021										
2019	76%	67%	9%	71%	5%					

		HISTO	RY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		ALGE	BRA EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%
<u> </u>		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

		Grade 6		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	100/72.2	137/48.8	144/51.2
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	4/11.8	4/11.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	4/17.4	5/21.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	72/28.7	115/41.1	138/48.8
	Students With Disabilities	1/50	1/100	1/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/33.3	2/66.7

		Grade 7		
		Grade 1		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	138/60.8	163/60.1	166/61.0
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	2/8.3	4/16.0
	English Language Learners	1/7.7	0/0	2/9.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	129/55.6	145/53.5	160/59
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/4.3
	English Language Learners	2/100	2/100	2/100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	3/75	4/80	6/85.7
	Students With Disabilities	3/75	4/80	6/85.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/100

		Grade 8		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	180/67.7	210/68.6	220/72.4
	Students With Disabilities	3/14.3	4/13.3	6/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	4/17.4	5/21.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	55/36.9	70/42.7	79/48.5
	Students With Disabilities	3/13.6	3/11.5	4/15.4
	English Language Learners	3/15.8	5/21.7	5/21.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students Economically Disadvantaged	66/26.1	103/34.9	182/66.2
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.3	2/7.1	5/23.8
	English Language Learners	1/6.7	0/0	6/28.6

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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
SWD	18	31	25	23	34	25	12	42			
ELL	28	53	54	34	40	37	19	52	45		
ASN	80	85		83	80		80		83		
BLK	42	46	30	35	34	34	29	62			
HSP	50	53	39	54	45	40	45	60	57		
MUL	73	64		69	61		73				
WHT	72	62	40	76	63	54	76	85	73		
FRL	49	51	35	52	46	36	50	62	48		
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
SWD	24	48	46	38	55	42	42	43			
ELL	26	48	44	49	60	51	25	40			

		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
ASN	88	44		96	83			100			
BLK	35	49	43	53	62	62	35	66	27		
HSP	58	61	52	70	68	61	59	73	48		
MUL	75	50		80	76						
WHT	74	63	58	86	80	61	86	86	73		
FRL	53	58	53	68	69	62	57	69	49		
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	39	36	29	46	42	28	53			
ELL	23	50	49	37	60	55		30			
ASN	95	80		100	95						
BLK	35	47	47	51	63	47	38	68	62		
HSP	57	59	48	64	66	58	64	79	48		
MUL	62	48		73	48						
IVIOL	02					1					
WHT	77	65	48	84	77	54	73	89	71		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	578
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO.
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	IN/A
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO.
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	110
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	123
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
	N/A
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students	67
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	67 NO

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our lowest performing area was in English Language Arts Learning Gains for the bottom 25%. Our gains were 38% in the Spring of 2021.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest decline from Spring 2019 to Spring 2021 was in English Language Arts Learning Gains for the bottom 25%. Our gains were 38% in the Spring of 2021, down from 52% in the Spring of 2019.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

CLMS scored equal to or higher than the state in all areas of the FSA. We will be working on the accelerated points. I believe their are two reasons for the low score in accelerated points. 1. CLMS is an ARTS school and most of students take electives in the arts rather than the technology courses. 2. In the past, CLMS only puts levels 4 and 5 in Algebra Honors thereby losing points in the numerator. Level 3 students are enrolled in Algebra this year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data that showed the greatest improvement is in the Middle School Acceleration points. CLMS gained 2 points moving from 65% to 67%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The CLMS math teamed worked collaboratively together throughout the year. Also during 2nd quarter of 2018-19, we moved approximately 100 students in math to ensure they were placed in the correct course.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Real-time interventions will be implemented based on i-Ready progress monitoring data. Also, staff will incorporate an increased number of high yield instructional strategies this year such as distributed summarizing and CLOSE reads.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Ongoing professional development will occur regarding high yield instructional strategies and SIOP as needed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continuity of leadership and a continued committment to professional learning initiatives (not a completely new plan each year) will provide an improved level of sustainability from year to year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of

Focus
Description
and

CLMS strives for continuous improvement in Learning gains, especially with our lowest performing ESSA subgroups. Our data indicates that this is an area of need.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

In the 2021-2022 school year, CLMS will increase ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%

from 38% (Spring 2021) to 50% as measured by the FSA in the Spring of 2022.

Teachers and members of the administrative team will regularly review an array of data points such as i-Ready progress monitoring data, district-created standards-based exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative.

Monitoring:

exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative. This data will not only be used to track progress toward meeting the learning gains goal, but also will serve as the foundation for collaborative PLC work where teachers work together toward the common goal of meeting student learning gains.

Person responsible for

for monitoring outcome:

Michael Cook (michaelrc@leeschools.net)

All students will be double blocked in ELA and progress monitored through exemplars & iReady.

ESE students are in a class with a general education and ESE teacher (co-teacher or support facilitator)

Level 1 and 2 readers will have a double block of reading. Fluid scheduling, especially for our lowest ESSA population will occur as data indicates.

Evidence-

based Strategy:

High yield strategies

To assist with data chats, the APC and reading coach pull data for teachers so they can focus on moving forward. We look at individual students in regards to SS points needed to make a learning gain and 3 year trend data.

All teachers are required to do 4 Close Reads in their content areas of which 2 are observed by coach. The reading coach will support them as needed.

All teachers have their classes reading silently for 10 minutes during lunch.

Studies show that increasing instructional time will increase learning, especially with our lowest performing ESSA subgroups.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Distributed Summarizing has 1.0 Effect size on learning. It is one of the most effective research based strategies. This strategy provides students with multiple opportunities to process their new learning.

Vocabulary Instruction has a .85 Effect size on student learning. Vocabulary has the fourth highest impact on learning of all strategies. Vocabulary has been found to be the most statistically significant predictor of reading ability and comprehension. All areas need to be aware of students reading ability and contribute what they can in their content to closing the reading gap. Awareness is the first step. Close Reads in all content areas help to teach the ELA standards. iReady will diagnose gaps and provide individualized learning paths to help increase competency of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Collaborative and productive PLCs
- 2. Use of the Curriculum Maps, Instructional Guides and High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing, Vocabulary Instruction, and CLOSE reads)
- 3. New Teachers will be given one full day to observe other teachers using successful strategies.
- 4. All teachers will be provided opportunities during planning periods to observe teachers using successful strategies.
- 5. All teachers will do 4 Close Reads during the year- 2 will be observed by Admin or a Coach
- 6. Data is presented at PLCs with best practices being shared for progress monitoring and data chats with individual students.
- 7. ESSA subgroup students will have their progress monitored by their case manager. Data chats with students will take place as well as supports not already mentioned above. Students will be allowed access to the Learning Lab for extra support.
- 8. Use of i-Ready to close achievement gaps and provide differentiation.

Person Responsible

Michael Cook (michaelrc@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of

Focus
Description
and

CLMS strives for continuous improvement in Learning gains, especially with our lowest performing ESSA subgroups. Our data indicates that this is an area of need.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

In the 2021-2022 school year, CLMS will increase Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%

from 43% (Spring 2021) to 52% as measured by the FSA in the Spring of 2022.

Teachers and members of the administrative team will regularly review an array of data points such as i-Ready progress monitoring data (STAR for Algebra 1 students), district-created standards-based exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative. This data will not only be used to track progress toward meeting

the learning gains goal, but also will serve as the foundation for collaborative PLC work where teachers work together toward the common goal of meeting student learning gains.

Person responsible for

monitoring outcome:

Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

i-Ready will be used to monitor progress and provide differentiation. All math students will be double blocked.

High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing, Vocabulary Instruction, Math literacy, and CLOSE reads) will be used throughout the school.

Evidence-

based Strategy: Before and after school tutoring in all Math areas. Homework Haven on Tuesday,

Wednesday and Thursday run by a math teacher.

Data chats are had with the math department regarding individual students using Math Data. The APC and reading coach pull data for teachers so they can focus on moving forward. We look at individual students in regards to SS points needed to make a learning gain and 3 year trend data with a laser focus on our lowest performing ESSA subgroup.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Studies show that increasing instructional time will increase learning. Distributed Summarizing has 1.0 Effect size on learning. It is one of the most effective research based strategies. This strategy provides students with multiple opportunities to process their new learning. Vocabulary Instruction has a .85 Effect size on student learning. Vocabulary has the fourth highest impact on learning of all strategies. Vocabulary has been found to be the most statistically significant predictor of reading ability and comprehension. This translates directly to math literacy as well. Teachers need to be aware of how many SS points each

student needs to make to get a learning gain. Awareness is key.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Collaborative and productive PLC's
- 2. Use of the Curriculum Maps, Instructional Guides and High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing, Vocabulary Instruction, Math Literacy, and CLOSE reads)
- 3. New Teachers will be given one full day to observe other teachers using successful strategies.
- 4. All teachers will be provided opportunities during planning periods to observe teachers using successful strategies.
- 5. Data chats are done in PLC.
- 6. Use of i-Ready for progress monitoring and differentiation.

Person Responsible

Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Middle School Acceleration

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Middle School Acceleration component of the Florida School Grading system is defined as, "This component is based on the percentage of eligible students who passed a high school level EOC assessment or industry certification." CLMS will strive to increase performance in this critical area as it will lead to more students being afforded the opportunity to enroll in and successfully complete Algebra 1 during middle school. Students are generally more successful in Algebra 1 and beyond if they are enrolled in the course in middle school rather than in high school. All students in 8th grade who scored proficient on the FSA during their 7th grade year will be enrolled in Algebra 1 for 8th grade.

Measurable Outcome:

In the 2021-2022 school year CLMS will increase Middle School Acceleration from 67% (Spring 2021) to 75% as measured by the FSA in the Spring of 2022.

Algebra 1 teachers and members of the administrative team will regularly review an array of data points such as STAR Math, district-created standards-based exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative. This data will not only be used to track progress toward meeting the learning gains goal, but also will serve as the foundation for collaborative PLC work where teachers work together toward the common goal of meeting student learning gains.

Person

responsible

Monitoring:

for monitoring outcome:

Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

STAR Math will be used to monitor progress and provide differentiation. All Algebra 1 students will be double blocked.

Evidencebased Strategy: High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing, Vocabulary Instruction, Math literacy, and CLOSE reads) will be used throughout the school. This includes Algebra 1 classes.

Before and after school tutoring for Algebra 1. Homework Haven on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday run by a math teacher.

Small group pullout (from electives) and additional tutoring will be provided to Algebra 1 students in order to ensure students are afforded every opportunity to be successful.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Studies show that increasing instructional time will increase learning. Distributed Summarizing has 1.0 Effect size on learning. It is one of the most effective research based strategies. This strategy provides students with multiple opportunities to process their new learning. Vocabulary Instruction has a .85 Effect size on student learning. Vocabulary has the fourth highest impact on learning of all strategies. Vocabulary has been found to be the most statistically significant predictor of reading ability and comprehension. This translates directly to math literacy as well. Teachers need to be aware of how many SS points each student needs to make to get a learning gain. Awareness is key.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Collaborative and productive PLC's
- 2. Use of the Curriculum Maps, Instructional Guides and High yield strategies (Distributed Summarizing, Vocabulary Instruction, Math Literacy, and CLOSE reads)
- 3. All teachers will be provided opportunities during planning periods to observe teachers using successful strategies.
- 4. Data chats are done in PLC.
- 5. Use of STAR Math for progress monitoring and differentiation.

6. Small group pullout (from electives) and additional tutoring will be provided to Algebra 1 students in order to ensure students are afforded every opportunity to be successful.

Person Responsible

Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

During the 2019-20 school year, CLMS reported 5.7 incidents per 100 students compared to the state average of 4.2. This put CLMS in the high category for incidents reported for middle schools in the state. Suspensions per 100 students at CLMS during the 2019-20 school year was 7.9 while the state average was 18.3. This put CLMS in the low category for middle schools in the state.

A primary area of concern is specific to the violent incident subcategory of the report. Peer conflicts that lead to fights play a major role in this area. A secondary area of concern is property incidents such as theft or destruction of property.

In order to promote a positive school culture and environment, members of the CLMS administrative team will regularly review school discipline data to identify trends and uncover areas for improvement. Furthermore, we will be proactive with our approach in order to identify and prevent many of the peer conflict issues that sometimes occur at the middle school level. For example, we will spend time as part of our PBIS system teaching students about the importance of kindness, compassion, and empathy all through the lens of building a positive Panther Community. Additionally, we will spend time delivering lessons regarding the proper use of social media as many of the peer conflicts we see are due to actions taken on social media platforms outside of school. We want to be proactive rather than reactive.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

CLMS includes input from many stakeholders within the school in the decision-making process. For example, the leadership team meets on a regular basis to discuss items such as PLC scheduling and work, matters of curriculum, the discipline matrix, the school dress code, our PBIS system, event/celebration planning, and so forth. It is highly-important that teachers and staff have a voice and functional role in these matters.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

As stated above, the school leadership team provides a lot of input into many areas that promote a positive culture. This team included members of administration, and various department head teachers. The team, with the help of other staff members, provides recognition to staff members who go above and beyond. Celebrations of this nature are critical to establishing and maintaining a positive culture. Additionally, the administrative team, with the help of the safety and security team and behavior specialist, work diligently to support teachers and staff when students become disruptive to the learning environment. A focus on restorative practices is implemented to teach students proper expectations and behavior rather than a sharp focus on punitive practices.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Middle School Acceleration	\$0.00
		Total:	\$0.00