

The School District of Lee County

Harns Marsh Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Harns Marsh Middle School

1820 UNICE AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

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

Demographics

Principal: Alex Dworzanski

Start Date for this Principal: 10/26/2020

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
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)	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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Harns Marsh Middle School

1820 UNICE AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://hmm.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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

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.

Every Student, Every Day, Gains Knowledge

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a World Class Middle School

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
Dworzanski, Alex	Principal	To build a collaborative leadership team, to build a culture that is focused on continuous improvement, to put systems in place that are constantly being re-evaluated to ensure that we are constantly improving, and to ensure that our curriculum is always aligned and learning focused
LaForce, Melissa	Instructional Coach	
Simpson, Caren	Instructional Coach	
Weich, April	Instructional Coach	
Martin, Yolaine	Assistant Principal	
Dutton, Sarai	Assistant Principal	
Restino, Joseph	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/26/2020, Alex Dworzanski

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.*

2

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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)	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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	424	425	460	0	0	0	0	1309
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	44	75	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	38	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	1	7	0	0	0	71
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	4	9	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	98	125	0	0	0	329
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	107	93	0	0	0	307

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	118	76	93	0	0	0	0	287

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	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	12
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 10/26/2020

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	495	498	447	0	0	0	0	1440
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	42	60	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	34	45	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	26	28	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	218	210	209	0	0	0	0	637

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	167	160	174	0	0	0	0	501

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	12	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	495	498	447	0	0	0	0	1440
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	42	60	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	34	45	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	26	28	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	218	210	209	0	0	0	0	637

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	167	160	174	0	0	0	0	501

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	12	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	42%	55%	54%	41%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	54%	53%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	44%	47%	37%	45%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	52%	64%	58%	44%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	63%	64%	57%	54%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	54%	51%	37%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	34%	50%	51%	34%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	70%	72%	45%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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	38%	52%	-14%	54%	-16%
	2018	39%	51%	-12%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	51%	-9%	52%	-10%
	2018	36%	50%	-14%	51%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	40%	57%	-17%	56%	-16%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	58%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%
	2018	25%	41%	-16%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	57%	-11%	54%	-8%
	2018	38%	65%	-27%	54%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
08	2019	46%	60%	-14%	46%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	47%	3%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	30%	46%	-16%	48%	-18%
	2018	35%	48%	-13%	50%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	67%	-3%	71%	-7%
2018	62%	66%	-4%	71%	-9%
Compare		2%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	59%	32%	61%	30%
2018	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
Compare		9%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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
SWD	15	44	43	27	54	49	14	36			
ELL	25	47	40	39	67	69	15	51	56		
BLK	35	47	43	43	60	53	34	66	76		
HSP	42	52	43	53	65	60	31	67	75		
MUL	50	47		69	78			89			
WHT	52	61	54	58	57	48	48	70	83		
FRL	40	52	45	49	61	55	30	67	71		
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
SWD	19	39	30	21	44	39	32	46			
ELL	23	50	46	30	53	53	17	61			
ASN	70	70		80	40						
BLK	31	47	35	33	48	37	25	64	58		
HSP	42	51	47	46	54	54	39	67	60		
MUL	53	66		47	66						
WHT	52	61	33	59	67	71	62	80	76		
FRL	38	51	41	42	53	48	36	65	68		
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
SWD	16	46	39	21	37	28	19	16			
ELL	11	39	38	17	44	39	5	20			
ASN	90	80		90							
BLK	28	43	30	31	41	31	19	30	92		
HSP	41	55	43	45	57	43	36	48	90		
MUL	41	38		43	60						
WHT	54	65	38	57	60	29	48	59	87		
FRL	36	51	39	39	50	34	31	41	88		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Our 8th grade science proficiency. We had a proficiency rate of 34%. This was a decline from the previous year. Two new teachers in 8th grade science that were not willing to put in the effort to scaffold the learning. The number of non-proficient students in reading and math have a high correlation to the science proficiency number. Our trend in science has been inconsistent with continuous improvement.

We have only one sub-group that is not above the 41% and that is our SWD. We have the highest percentage of IS students at the middle level. Their behavior greatly impacts their ability to learn if they are removed from their class, but leaving them in the classroom has a negative effect on students that are making the correct decisions of their learning. It is a balance deciding when the cost of lost learning for one student outweighs the cost of their peers. We are working as a collective team of teachers, administrators, and students to find ways to ensure learning at high levels for all students.

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

Science had a 5% decrease. see 1a

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our proficiency in ELA has an eleven point gap. The factors that lead to this is the percent of students that come to us non-proficient. We have made consistent gains in moving non-proficient to proficient.

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

Our math gains moved from 55% the previous school year to 63% this year. We put in a tier 3 class to support the learning of our students that were significantly below level and that had gaps in their learning. The program ALEKS was used to truly differentiate each student's learning path.

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

We will increase attendance by recognizing students and teachers for perfect attendance monthly. They will earn a pin for lanyard for perfect attendance. For Behavior we will track using a percentage for our student population.

We will close the achievement gap from 34% of SWD to 41% or greater.

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

1. ELA proficient students show an increase
2. Math proficient students show an increase
3. Learning gains in ELA show a positive trend
4. Learning gains in math show a positive trend
5. Science proficient students show alignment with the ELA and math data
6. Increase in student attendance rate
7. Increase our SWD making learning gains
8. Increase our SWD reaching proficiency
9. Increase our SWD making learning gains in the L25 group

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD will be an area of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20.

Measurable Outcome: SWD performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alex Dworzanski (alexjd@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for low performing ESSA subgroup students at our school. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible Alex Dworzanski (alexjd@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our school consistently has around 35% proficient at the beginning of each school year. We end with a gain of around 6% proficient. I would like to see us move a minimum of 10% to proficiency each year so that we send them off ready for high school and the reading level that is required for graduation. In addition, we have remained around the 50% in ELA gains for the past 3 years. We have a goal to increase the percentage of students to 70% or higher. We truly believe that all students should make learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: HMMS ELA Proficiency will increase from 42% to 47% as measured by the Spring 2021 ELA FSA. Our ELA learning gains will increase from 52% making gains to 56% making ELA gains as measured by the FSA ELA assessment in 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: April Weich (aprilmk@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Higher Order Thinking questions embedded into all lesson plans and teaching
2. Numbered Heads used school-wide
3. Writing to raise achievement school-wide
4. Use of iReady for progress monitoring and individualized instruction
5. Distributive Summarizing

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: I used the research of John Hattie and the research from Learning Focused to determine the high effect size strategies to increase proficiency. Data driven instruction is proven in increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. HOT embedded in lesson plans
2. Number Heads Observed during classroom walk-throughs
3. Writing embedded in lesson plans
4. Lesson plans in the hands of every core teacher while instruction is occurring
5. Lesson plans collaboratively developed and researched based are checked weekly by the department heads, coaches, and administrative team
6. Implementation of iReady for progress monitoring and differentiation
7. Closely monitor low performing ESSA subgroup and increase supports as data indicates

Person Responsible April Weich (aprilmk@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our data for science has been inconsistent. We need to align our teaching practices and use researched strategies to ensure students retain the information and are able to read the science content. Our data does not align with our ELA and Math data for proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: HMMS science proficiency score will increase from 34% to 39% as measured by the science FCAT in the Spring of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alex Dworzanski (alexjd@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Higher Order Thinking
2. Numbered heads
3. Writing to learn
4. Teacher Efficacy
5. Progress monitoring
6. Closely monitor ESSA subgroups and increase supports as data indicates

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's Visible Learning High Effect Size Strategies and Learning Focused best practices and researched strategies

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common Planning in the Master Schedule
2. Weekly PLC meetings attended by an administrator
3. Common lessons taught
4. Common formative assessments and quality feedback
5. Scaffolding of the reading material and math concepts so that the science can be understood and science data accurately calculated.
6. Required planning on Tuesday and Thursday during their planning time to work on lesson plans and data
7. Closely monitor ESSA subgroups and increase supports as data indicates.

Person Responsible Yolaine Martin (yolainem@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students need to be in regular attendance and serving OSS does not allow them to be at school receiving the instruction by a highly qualified teacher.

Measurable Outcome: HMMS will decrease from 14.3% to 13.3% by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alex Dworzanski (alexjd@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: All teachers will be invited to attend CHAMPS training in October and November on Saturdays. The strategies in CHAMPS are based on research and best practices. Students and parents will be offered other opportunities in lieu of OSS. For example: after school work program, ATS, Parent Academic/Behavioral meeting and contract.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers that use the CHAMPS strategies have less discipline concerns and problems in their classes. The program used with fidelity will allow the students to stay in the class learning instead of at home serving OSS.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PD - CHAMPS
2. Data pulled to determine which teacher needs additional support in their classrooms.
3. Data pulled will determine which students need additional support
4. Counselors will meet with the students after serving OSS and returning to school
5. An administrator will meet with the student serving OSS after they return to school
6. Closely monitor ESSA subgroup data and increase supports when data indicates need.

Person Responsible: Alex Dworzanski (alexjd@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Math has shown consistent improvement over the past three years. We will continue to monitor the data from the formative assessments and from the program IReady and ALEKS to make certain that we do not lose progress in this area.

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.

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.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00