

The School District of Lee County

Gulf 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Gulf Middle School

1809 SW 36TH TER, Cape Coral, FL 33914

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

Demographics

Principal: James Moreland

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)	84%
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 (64%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (66%) 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	22

Gulf Middle School

1809 SW 36TH TER, Cape Coral, FL 33914

<http://gfm.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	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

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.

Gulf Middle School will provide a world-class education; defined by high-expectations and real-world experiences by way of a safe and nurturing environment that fosters well-informed and educated contributing members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gulf Middle School envisions every student reaching their highest potential by encouraging the value in life-long learning and an appreciation for what success looks like in an ever-changing global economy.

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
Moreland, James	Principal	
Duke, Cassandra	Teacher, K-12	
Toadvine, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Winfield, Emma	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/26/2020, James Moreland

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.*

1

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.*

17

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)	84%
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 (64%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (66%) 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	243	281	264	0	0	0	0	788	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	8	0	0	0	0	29	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	14	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	6	0	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	7	2	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	32	32	0	0	0	0	93	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	33	25	0	0	0	0	91	

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	25	35	20	0	0	0	0	80	

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	
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 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	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	

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	62%	55%	54%	65%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	54%	64%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	44%	47%	52%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	76%	64%	58%	68%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	73%	64%	57%	70%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	54%	51%	68%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	59%	50%	51%	61%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	70%	72%	74%	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	61%	52%	9%	54%	7%
	2018	67%	51%	16%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	51%	8%	52%	7%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	51%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	60%	57%	3%	56%	4%
	2018	66%	56%	10%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	47%	47%	0%	55%	-8%
	2018	45%	41%	4%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	75%	57%	18%	54%	21%
	2018	80%	65%	15%	54%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		30%				
08	2019	78%	60%	18%	46%	32%
	2018	62%	47%	15%	45%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	59%	46%	13%	48%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	48%	18%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	72%	67%	5%	71%	1%
2018	68%	66%	2%	71%	-3%
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	94%	59%	35%	61%	33%
2018	91%	60%	31%	62%	29%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%

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	14	38	34	35	50	43	13	28			
ELL	42	53	39	63	73	67	33	53			
ASN	75	75		100	75						

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
BLK	45	38	18	52	42	17		60			
HSP	54	55	47	72	75	71	48	70	68		
MUL	59	52		59	67						
WHT	67	59	30	80	74	62	67	80	73		
FRL	52	52	36	68	69	59	44	63	60		
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	16	31	29	29	57	54	19	43			
ELL	43	63	54	50	54	41		46			
ASN	100	80		90	60						
BLK	53	55	50	57	78	88	75				
HSP	59	59	47	66	65	58	56	60	65		
MUL	64	68		68	64	50					
WHT	69	63	51	79	75	67	74	73	70		
FRL	57	55	45	66	69	66	61	56	62		
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	11	38	43	25	49	48	13	27			
ELL	30	56	61	53	81	81					
ASN	100	82		100	82						
BLK	57	67	42	48	59	46	45	82			
HSP	58	63	53	64	73	76	48	70	68		
MUL	62	63		62	68						
WHT	68	64	53	71	69	67	68	75	76		
FRL	54	60	51	57	65	64	50	68	67		

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	654
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	56
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	81
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
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	59
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	
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	66
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	59
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 ELA L25 was our lowest performing data component this past year. We lost both reading teachers that had these students.

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

Our ELA L25 was our lowest performing data component this past year. We lost both reading teachers that had these students.

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 6th grade math proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state. The district and the state increased their proficiency in this area. Although we did see some improvement in this area, the district percentage increase was more than double our school.

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

Our 8th grade math proficiency increased by 16%. We worked very hard to provide additional instructional supports through these classes.

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

8th grade attendance is still a major concern. When we compare the attendance in the other two grades, our 8th grade attendance is almost double the other two.

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

1. ELA L25
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Black/African American and SWD will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20.

Measurable Outcome:

Black/African American and SWD performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Moreland (jameswmo@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

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Last year's proficiency level within Science decreased from 69% to 59%. Proficiency is what we strive towards and this percentage needs to increase.
Measurable Outcome:	Our school will work towards increasing this percentage to 61%. This will provide teachers with an attainable goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This year we will focus on the high yield strategies used in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We plan to monitor the use of high yield strategies through walkthroughs during the school year. We use high yield strategies that have the highest effect size as measure by Hattie.
Action Steps to Implement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This walk through will be purposely scheduled. 2. This will provide teachers with the time to prepare knowing administration's expectations. 3. Administration will leave a positive on each teachers' desk but then follow up with teacher to provide feedback on the strategy used. 4. For the remainder of the school year, administration will be reviewing lesson plans for the strategies implemented as well as visiting the classroom on those dates to confirm use. 	
Person Responsible	James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Last year's proficiency level within Math L25 decreased from 65% to 62%. Proficiency is what we strive towards and this percentage needs to increase.

Measurable Outcome: Our school will work towards increasing this percentage to 64%. This will provide teachers with an attainable goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: This year we will focus on the high yield strategies used in the classroom. We will also implement iReady to monitor progress, provide diagnostics and individualized learning paths to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We plan to monitor the use of high yield strategies through walkthroughs during the school year. iReady will also provide the necessary data to drive instruction and increase performance of standards mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

1. This walk through will be purposely scheduled.
2. This will provide teachers with the time to prepare knowing administration's expectations.
3. Administration will leave a positive on each teachers' desk but then follow up with teacher to provide feedback on the strategy used.
4. For the remainder of the school year, administration will be reviewing lesson plans for the strategies implemented as well as visiting the classroom on those dates to confirm use.
5. Use of iReady for progress monitoring and differentiation
6. Closely monitor ESSA subgroups and increase supports as data indicates

Person Responsible James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Last year's proficiency level within ELA L25 decreased from 49% to 38%. Proficiency is what we strive towards and this percentage needs to increase.
Measurable Outcome:	Our school will work towards increasing this percentage to 42%. This will provide teachers with an attainable goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This year we will focus on the high yield strategies used in the classroom. We will also double block ELA for all students and double block reading for levels 1 and 2 students. We will implement iReady diagnostics, progress monitoring and individualized learning paths to increase mastery of LAFS standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The high yield instructional strategies used are considered to have a high effect size as measured by Hattie. In addition, iReady will provide targeted intervention to increase mastery of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. This walk through will be purposely scheduled.
2. This will provide teachers with the time to prepare knowing administration's expectations.
3. Administration will leave a positive on each teachers' desk but then follow up with teacher to provide feedback on the strategy used.
4. For the remainder of the school year, administration will be reviewing lesson plans for the strategies implemented as well as visiting the classroom on those dates to confirm use.
5. Use of iReady to progress monitor and fill in gaps or enrich mastery of standards.
6. Close monitoring of our lowest performing ESSA subgroups to increase support as data indicates.

Person Responsible James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

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

Description and Rationale: Last year, 50 8th grade students received one or more Out-of-School Suspensions (OSS). This equated to 18% of our student enrollment.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to bring this percentage under 16%. To do this we will have to reduce our number of 8th students students receiving OSS by 5 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Emma Winfield (emmamw@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: This year we will focus on improving our PBIS system. We have to make sure that all incentive programs (i.e. grade level socials, Fun Fridays, Splash Card, and Positive Referrals) continue to have the same level attention consistently throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: From a discipline standpoint, we will make even more use of our Alternative to Suspension program. Students that remain in class will have more learning opportunities, especially our lowest performing subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. This is a restorative justice program where students write a reflection and an apology in regards to the incident that occurred.
2. If acceptable, students are then allowed to serve their OSS with an after-school work detail in its place.
3. Closely monitor lowest performing subgroup data and increase supports when data indicates.

Person Responsible: Emma Winfield (emmamw@leeschools.net)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

8th Grade attendance is a major concern when attendance is compared to the other two grades. 8th grade students' absenteeism was the highest of all three grades.

Measurable Outcome: Gulf Middle school will reduce the percentage of 8th grade students missing more than 10% of the year from 13.4% to 12.0%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will be instituting a school-wide attendance awareness program. This will be conducted through first period. First period teachers will be asked to monitor any attendance issues within their first period class. They will make the time to speak with the student to build a relationship and determine the cause of their absenteeism or tardiness. The teacher will then report their findings to the school attendance task force..

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The school attendance task force (ATF) will be composed of the security specialist, guidance counselors, SRO, social worker, assistant principals, and the principal. The security specialist will be responsible for pulling attendance reports on a bi-weekly basis and calling any special meetings. Students who are in school on a regular basis have access to more instruction than students who miss school. This is especially true for our low performing students who already have gaps in their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Regular meetings will be held on a monthly basis with administration attending quarterly.
2. ATF will identify/confirm causation (i.e. lack of incentive/motivation/ability) and determine the level of intervention necessary.
3. We will then meet with the family and develop a person plan designed to help address the issue
4. Closely monitor our lowest performing ESSA subgroups and provide increased support when data indicates.

Person Responsible James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Maintain or improve in all other areas.

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00