

The School District of Lee County

Fort Myers Technical College



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	8
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	11

Fort Myers Technical College

3800 MICHIGAN AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://www.fortmyerstech.edu/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-Adult	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Career and Technical Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

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 mission of Fort Myers Technical College is to provide high quality career and technical training, in order to prepare students for current and emerging industries, delivered by a professional and caring staff in a positive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students enrolled in vocational/technical programs will obtain workforce credentials through certificate programs and, where applicable, industry certification and/or licensure.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Mangan, Brian	Other
Brooks, Kimberly	Assistant Principal
McDaniel, George	Assistant Principal
Redenius, Nancy	Teacher, Career/Technical

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Fort Myers Technical College (FMTC) consists of the main campus and the Southwest Florida Public Service Academy (SWFPSA). Brian Mangan is the Senior Director and has day to day responsibilities in leading FMTC with oversight of the SWFPSA. Todd Everly is the Director of the SWFPSA with day to day operational responsibilities. Gene Sims is the Assistant Director of the SWFPSA and supports the Director and daily operations on campus. George McDaniel is responsible for Operations and Finance at FMTC. Kim Brooks is responsible for Curriculum at FMTC. Each administrator is responsible for conducting classroom walkthroughs, targeted observations, formal observations and annual evaluations on instructional staff. As an example of shared decision making each campus meets with program instructors on an annual basis to review everything from FLDOE Curriculum Frameworks, Master Plans of Instruction, Career MAPS, Fee and Disclosure sheets, textbook and curriculum resources, and laboratory equipment. As a team the administrators and program instructors prioritize what needs to be changed and what needs to be maintained in order to ensure program currency with industry.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 7/3/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

FMTC lowest performing data component is in Completion. It is a trend that has shown four years of continuous improvement.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

FMTC had a 1% decline in licensure.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Not applicable.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Placement showed the most improvement. It is not a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The reorganization of the Student Services Department that allowed the Career Specialist to focus on Placement activities.

School Data

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	55%	56%	0%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	50%	53%	0%	44%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	44%	0%	36%	38%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	0%	54%	51%	0%	38%	43%
Math Learning Gains	0%	43%	48%	0%	32%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	45%	0%	34%	38%
Science Achievement	0%	70%	67%	0%	59%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	66%	71%	0%	62%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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
09	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Completion
Rationale	To provide staff with the ability to assist students with scholarships to overcome the financial burden of a life obstacle.
Intended Outcome	The percentage of students completing their programs will increase from the previous year. 85 to 87%.
Point Person	George McDaniel (georgem@leeschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructors and Staff provide access to scholarship applications for students who indicate encountering life obstacles. 2. The students will attend information sessions followed by individual meetings with an Admissions Officer in order to clearly articulate the students desires and to properly align them with the best program to fulfill the desire. 3. Professional development for the Career Specialist to enhance skills in providing direct support to students enrolled in programs.
Person Responsible	George McDaniel (georgem@leeschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scholarship committee meetings throughout the school year. 2. Weekly review of enrollment figures. 3. College and Career Network and Career Center activities.
Person Responsible	George McDaniel (georgem@leeschools.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Placement
Rationale	To provide staff with increased amount of exposure, training and practical application of employability skills in order to enhance their ability to be placed in the industry.
Intended Outcome	The percentage of students being placed from their program will increase from the previous year. 91% to 92%
Point Person	Kimberly Brooks (kimberlyab@leeschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructors and Staff will increase employability skills in lesson instruction and project based learning. 2. The students will be given opportunities to participate in Cooperative Education and Externships for thier respective programs.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Brooks (kimberlyab@leeschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assistant Director for Curriculum will monitor lesson plans weekly. 2. Administration review of placement percentages.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Brooks (kimberlyab@leeschools.net)

Activity #3

Title Licensure

Rationale Identifying students that may struggle to pass the state licensure exam

Intended Outcome The percentage of students earning their state licensure will increase from the previous year. 95% to 96%

Point Person Nancy Redenius (nancygr@leeschools.net)

Action Step

Description Instructors will proctor practice exams for students and then review the results to determine support levels for students whose performance may indicate they will struggle to pass the state licensure exam.

Person Responsible Nancy Redenius (nancygr@leeschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Administration annual review of Licensure performance.

Person Responsible Nancy Redenius (nancygr@leeschools.net)

Activity #4

Title Attendance

Rationale Student habits that do not reflect strong attendance behaviors

Intended Outcome The overall student attendance average will increase from the previous year. 92% to 93%

Point Person Kimberly Brooks (kimberlyab@leeschools.net)

Action Step

Description FMTC Instructors meet weekly with students and attendance will be part of the discussion
And any issues will be escalated to Student Services.

Person Responsible Kimberly Brooks (kimberlyab@leeschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Administration reviews TMS and Competency Reports.

Person Responsible Kimberly Brooks (kimberlyab@leeschools.net)

Activity #5	
Title	Behavior
Rationale	Improve student habits that do not reflect positive behaviors for employment.
Intended Outcome	The overall student discipline total will decrease from the previous year. 84 to 75.
Point Person	George McDaniel (georgem@leeschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	FMTC Instructors meet weekly with students and discipline will be part of the discussion and any issues will be escalated to Student Services.
Person Responsible	George McDaniel (georgem@leeschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	

Description	Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of Implementation of G5.B1.S1
	Administration reviews Disciplinary Hearings.
Person Responsible	George McDaniel (georgem@leeschools.net)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$9,200.00
---------------	-------------------