

The School District of Lee County

Young Parent Education Program



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Young Parent Education Program

3650 MICHIGAN AVE STE 2, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://lamp.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Mary Grace Romo

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Young Parent Education Program

3650 MICHIGAN AVE STE 2, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://lamp.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative 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.

To provide a nurturing academic environment that empowers and motivates students to become responsible, respectful, and productive parents in their communities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

For all our students to become productive members of their community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Andrew, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Saldana, Sandra	School Counselor	
Hiske, Angela	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/24/2020, Mary Grace Romo

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

10

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Students with 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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/24/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**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		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4	8	22	54	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	6	19	1	35	
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	3	6	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	6	16	1	33	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	5	15	1	29

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

Prior Year - 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		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4	8	22	54	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	6	19	1	35	
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	3	6	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	6	16	1	33	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	5	15	1	29

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	2	0	0	0	2	4	
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

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	55%	56%	0%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	49%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	42%	0%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	50%	51%	0%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	45%	48%	0%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	45%	0%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	62%	68%	0%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	67%	73%	0%	63%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019					
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	51%	-51%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	18%	57%	-39%	56%	-38%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
09	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	20%	50%	-30%	53%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	60%	-60%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	46%	-46%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	56%	-56%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	66%	-66%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	11%	64%	-53%	70%	-59%
2018	13%	62%	-49%	68%	-55%
Compare		-2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	59%	-59%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	50%	-42%	57%	-49%
2018	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
Compare		8%			

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL											
HSP											
FRL				8							
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

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	19
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	116
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	20
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	4
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The number of students with attendance below 90% is high for our school is high, however this is expected since we are a program for pregnant teens. Per state TAP guidelines if a mother or her child

miss school due to health we cannot penalize them. Our next category with a high percentage of students is "students displaying more than one indicator." This trend is due to the attendance.

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

Students scoring a level 1 on state assessments showed the greatest decline. We enrolled many new ESOL students and they are starting with the Rosetta Stone program. We currently have 27 ELL students enrolled.

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.

The number of students with attendance below 90% is high for our school is high, however this is expected since we are a program for pregnant teens. Per state TAP guidelines if a mother or her child miss school due to health we cannot penalize them.

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

Our "students with two or more indicators" has shown the greatest improvement from the prior year. The teaching staff set aside one PLC a month to identify learning needs for individual students, which helped to increase in the other categories.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

For all questions in this section we used the EWS data due to the fact that LAMP does not receive a school grade and does not have data reported in II. A, B, C,D. Students scoring at a level 1 is an area of concern.

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

1. Attendance (Improve unexcused absences)
2. Students scoring at a level 1
3. Increase student lexile level
4. STAR Reading and Math
5. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Attendance is imperative to experiencing classroom success. Missing 2 days per month from Kindergarten to 12th grade is equal to missing over 1 school year.

Measurable Outcome: In the 2020/2021 school year, we will decrease the % of chronically absent students (10 or more absences) from 82% (2018/2019 School year data due to COVID19 school closure) to 74% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by June 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Andrew (rebeccaan@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Follow the MTSS Attendance pyramid of interventions using the Professional Learning Community model. Utilize the Early Warning System to ensure early interventions are put into place for students. Child Study Teams and constant attendance monitoring will occur.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Following a systematic approach to track data and create individual plans for students will help to increase attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create MTSS Attendance Pyramid
2. Plan PLC meetings
3. Complete group and individual student plans
4. Continue to monitor attendance
5. Mentoring program

Person Responsible

Rebecca Andrew (rebeccaan@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic achievement will increase with minimal wasted time or disruptions during class-time. Attendance (not missing school for ISS and OSS) is imperative for classroom success as well.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020/2021 school year, we will maintain the number of students receiving ISS and/or OSS at less than 10% as measured by SESIR reported to District Support Application System by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Andrew (rebeccaan@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Support Trauma Informed Care Conscious Discipline
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student behavior greatly impacts classroom success due to interruptions, loss of instruction, and/or attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PBS Store
2. Student Mentoring Groups
3. Full Time LCSW
4. Small groups and de-escalation strategies
5. restorative justice

Person Responsible Rebecca Andrew (rebeccaan@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Other priorities will be addressed through the professional learning community model. Data will drive the decision-making during these meetings as well.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an open house and the Annual Title I meeting where staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school.

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by attending the Annual Title 1 Meeting and the on-going School Advisory Committee meetings. During these meetings the following information will be shared with stakeholders: data for all student groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, migrant, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically underserved, and identifying school needs. Stakeholders will participate as the result of (invitations through the school newsletter, Peach Jar, school website, personal phone calls, transportation provided by utilizing our Title 1 van, and flexible meeting times. Community partners will be invited to these events as well as help plan them.

Input from stakeholders will be collected through surveys, discussions, and meeting notes. These communications will be flexible in formats such as online, in person or on paper allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan. Stakeholders will be involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the school wide plan by helping to create and review it during SAC quarterly meetings. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00