

The School District of Lee County

Challenger 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	20

Challenger Middle School

624 TRAFALGAR PKWY, Cape Coral, FL 33991

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

Demographics

Principal: Stacia Winfree

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	No
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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	20

Challenger Middle School

624 TRAFALGAR PKWY, Cape Coral, FL 33991

<http://chm.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	No	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	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.

To provide an exemplary education that develops critical thinking and problems skills which inspire our students to challenge their minds and charge their spirit.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To develop lifelong learners with critical thinking and problem solving skills.

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
Berry, Dana	Principal	Instructional leader of Challenger Middle.
Curls, Aaron	Assistant Principal	
VanCleve, Jamie	Attendance/Social Work	MTSS
Dietz, Leta	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Samz, James	Teacher, K-12	
Becker, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	Social Emotional Learning
McDaniel, Dawn	Other	ESE Case Manager; Scheduling for Paraprofessionals

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/26/2020, Stacia Winfree

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.*

12

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.*

11

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	No
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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	364	371	361	0	0	0	0	1096	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	17	0	0	0	0	47	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	23	0	0	0	0	49	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	64	37	0	0	0	0	153	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	65	42	0	0	0	0	143	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	64	37	0	0	0	0	153	

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	36	46	31	0	0	0	0	113

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	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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	377	367	349	0	0	0	0	1093	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	20	0	0	0	0	47	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	12	0	0	0	0	31	
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	68	48	69	0	0	0	0	185	

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	56	127	141	0	0	0	0	324	

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	

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	377	367	349	0	0	0	0	1093
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	20	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	12	0	0	0	0	31
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	68	48	69	0	0	0	0	185

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	56	127	141	0	0	0	0	324

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	

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	63%	55%	54%	61%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	54%	60%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	44%	47%	47%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	74%	64%	58%	70%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	73%	64%	57%	69%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	54%	51%	56%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	58%	50%	51%	49%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	70%	72%	79%	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	57%	52%	5%	54%	3%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	51%	11%	52%	10%
	2018	56%	50%	6%	51%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	66%	57%	9%	56%	10%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	53%	47%	6%	55%	-2%
	2018	44%	41%	3%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	68%	57%	11%	54%	14%
	2018	79%	65%	14%	54%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
08	2019	78%	60%	18%	46%	32%
	2018	79%	47%	32%	45%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	56%	46%	10%	48%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	64%	48%	16%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	75%	67%	8%	71%	4%
2018	79%	66%	13%	71%	8%
Compare		-4%			
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	96%	59%	37%	61%	35%
2018	99%	60%	39%	62%	37%
Compare		-3%			
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	23	49	44	35	47	41	30	36	24		
ELL	35	59	60	47	68	56	36	50	38		

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
ASN	76	65		88	100						
BLK	51	51	28	63	73	71	33	71			
HSP	60	64	61	70	72	59	56	70	62		
MUL	54	61	67	73	75	80	43	85			
WHT	67	61	48	78	74	58	62	81	59		
FRL	56	58	52	67	72	58	50	71	54		
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	17	43	41	32	57	62	36	43			
ELL	30	54	53	42	63	61	7	68			
ASN	80	80		90	85						
BLK	43	49	41	62	76	67	33	53	38		
HSP	58	61	50	72	78	72	57	76	55		
MUL	53	50	36	68	71	58	38	80			
WHT	66	58	49	80	79	66	74	83	63		
FRL	55	56	49	70	77	65	57	74	53		
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	20	40	38	31	49	40	20	50	25		
ELL	30	55	56	26	51	47	14	38			
ASN	71	57		76	71						
BLK	30	42	43	48	65	55	7	78			
HSP	58	59	55	66	66	58	46	75	72		
MUL	61	58		71	65	64	46				
WHT	66	62	40	74	72	54	54	80	74		
FRL	54	56	48	63	65	52	36	73	57		

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	63
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	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	632
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	50
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	63
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 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	65
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	58
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.

6th Grade Math showed the lowest performance, but made a 9% increase from the previous year. The reason for the low performance in 6th grade math is that all students performing on grade level and above on the 5th Grade FSA were placed on an advanced track which means they took the 7th Grade FSA. The students taking the 6th Grade FSA would only be those that were not proficient on the 5th Grade FSA.

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

7th Grade Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year, although we are still well above the district and state average proficiency level. The contributing factor to this decline was a change in teachers. We lost two highly effective math teachers and had an ineffective teacher in the 7th grade classroom that was replaced mid-year. The replacement teacher was a new teacher who also lacked training.

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 greatest negative gap when compared to the state is 6th grade math. This negative gap is due to the scheduling progression, where all of our high-level students are placed in 7th grade math and take the 7th grade FSA.

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

6th Grade Math showed the most improvement, we attribute this achievement to hiring new, highly qualified teachers who taught 6th grade math.

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

Our areas of concern are the increase in number of students with 2 or more indicators in the early warning system, and the increase of students that are a level 1.

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

1. Reduce the number of students identified as chronically absent by a minimum of 10%
2. Reduce the number of student referrals/OSS.
3. Ensure the 6th/7th grade - Math instructional shifts are producing the intended result.
4. ESE personnel professional development and changes as needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We had 183 chronically absent students in the 2018-19 school year (this number being confirmed). Simply stated, students must be in school engaged in their learning for academic gains to occur.
Measurable Outcome:	Challenger Middle School will decrease the number of chronically absent students (18 days per year) by 10% from 2018-19 attendance performance measurement as indicated in Focus attendance records and early warning system. 183 students in FY18-19 decreased by 10% would indicate a goal of 165 students for FY 20-21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie VanCleve (jamiev@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Challenger will implement an attendance focus group comprised of an administrator, school social worker, counselors and MTSS personnel. We will meet weekly to ensure strategies established by the group are effectively implemented and having the intended results as measured by current attendance records. Special focus on attendance of our lowest performing ESSA subgroup will be measured to ensure students are in attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Simply stated, there is a direct correlation between student absences and academic achievement. By 6th grade, absenteeism is one of three signs that a student may drop out of high school. Missing 10 percent, or about 18 days, of the school year can drastically affect a student's academic success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement weekly attendance focus group.
2. Addition of full-time MTSS personnel.
3. Monthly attendance letters for all students who have been absent 5, 7 or 10 days.
4. Potential schedule changes to ensure attendance of all academic courses.
5. Consistent contact with students and parents for those students identified as chronically absent.

Person Responsible Jamie VanCleve (jamiev@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: There is a direct correlation between behavior and student achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to decrease the number of referrals and out of school suspension (OSS) by 50% over the previous year. .

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dana Berry (danaab@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Challenger Middle will use professional development, a revised PBIS and a revised MTSS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teaching behavioral expectations and rewarding students for following them is a much more positive approach than waiting for misbehavior to occur before responding. A reformed PBIS system will positively impact student performance and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Update and overhaul PBIS system
2. MTSS behavior support for repeated behavior infractions
3. Staff PD to support teachers with positive responses to behavior concerns
4. Review and share progress monitoring data with parents, students, and staff
5. Closely monitor discipline of lowest performing ESSA subgroup to adjust supports.

Person Responsible Dana Berry (danaab@leeschools.net)

#3. 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:

Dana Berry (danaab@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for SWD students at Challenger Middle 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

Dana Berry (danaab@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Weekly meetings with attendance team (Admin., Intervention Specialist, Social Worker, teachers) focused on identifying patterns of absenteeism, creating relationships with students and families, and collaborating on opportunities to decrease absenteeism with students who have greater than 10% absenteeism. School will increase communication using district approved material from 'Campaign 20-21' about the importance of attendance via all appropriate avenues including but not limited to social media, school website, parent messages, parent informational presentations, and flyers. School will mail letters home at 5 & 10 days of absence and student contracts will be used as part of the positive behavior support measures as needed. Admin team will create a visual representation for grade level identification of positive attendance trends with celebrations for teams/grade levels that show improvement. This information will be maintained in a common area of the building such as the main hallway of the school. There will be school-wide professional development for staff on positive parent support, student conferencing, and identifying solutions to barriers that may impede regular attendance.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00