

The School District of Lee County

Lexington 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

Lexington Middle School

16351 SUMMERLIN RD, Fort Myers, FL 33908

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristin Bueno

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)	95%
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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

Lexington Middle School

16351 SUMMERLIN RD, Fort Myers, FL 33908

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">68%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">61%</p>

School Grades History

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

Lexington Middle School Mission Statement: Lexington Middle School will provide each student the opportunity to develop the educational skills, knowledge, attitude, and character to become compassionate, lifelong learners with an intercultural understanding and respect in order to make a positive impact in the community and the world.

IB Mission Statement: The International Baccalaureate aims to develop inquiring knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect. To this end, the organization works with schools, governments, and international organizations to develop challenging programs of international education and rigorous assessment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lexington Middle School Vision Statement: To become 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
Bueno, Kristin	Principal	Facilitate the learning of all students by leading the staff and faculty.
Sanders, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	
Peters, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Anderson, Ben	Teacher, K-12	
Kroll, James	Instructional Coach	IB Coordinator and instructional coach
Beecroft, Alaina	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coordinator and instructional coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/26/2020, Kristin Bueno

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.*

4

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.*

10

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)	95%
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	361	343	337	0	0	0	0	1041
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	28	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	14	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	8	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	15	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	59	67	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	46	47	0	0	0	0	138

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	49	53	0	0	0	0	138

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	8
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	367	374	378	0	0	0	0	1119
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	48	46	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	46	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	93	110	0	0	0	0	289

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	68	94	0	0	0	0	198

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	4	4	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	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	367	374	378	0	0	0	0	1119
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	48	46	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	46	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	93	110	0	0	0	0	289

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	68	94	0	0	0	0	198

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	4	4	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	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	61%	55%	54%	65%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	54%	64%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	44%	47%	55%	45%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	71%	64%	58%	71%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	69%	64%	57%	69%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	54%	51%	47%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	50%	51%	55%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	70%	72%	78%	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	55%	52%	3%	54%	1%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	51%	6%	52%	5%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	63%	57%	6%	56%	7%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	47%	1%	55%	-7%
	2018	43%	41%	2%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	67%	57%	10%	54%	13%
	2018	77%	65%	12%	54%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
08	2019	70%	60%	10%	46%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	41%	47%	-6%	45%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	47%	46%	1%	48%	-1%
	2018	55%	48%	7%	50%	5%
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	78%	66%	12%	71%	7%
Compare		-3%			

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	93%	59%	34%	61%	32%
2018	99%	60%	39%	62%	37%
Compare		-6%			

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	24	40	32	34	50	52	13	46	60		
ELL	25	39	32	43	59	58	24	32	53		
ASN	78	71		89	80		75	85	92		
BLK	43	50	34	47	58	57	35	67	79		
HSP	50	49	38	59	61	59	33	67	64		
MUL	76	56		94	80						
WHT	73	64	55	85	77	64	62	91	72		
FRL	49	53	42	58	61	58	39	69	63		
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	21	37	33	27	41	41	19	37			
ELL	16	44	42	29	51	49	18	56			
ASN	81	71		86	74		55	100			
BLK	40	40	25	46	52	45	37	67	75		
HSP	44	50	42	58	52	43	39	73	82		
MUL	79	78		79	56						
WHT	70	58	46	81	73	53	69	87	73		
FRL	43	46	35	57	54	44	40	68	69		
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	17	52	53	26	53	48	7	50			
ELL	33	51	46	34	40	32	9	30			
ASN	81	58		88	77			82			
BLK	43	56	53	44	55	40	29	65	75		
HSP	51	63	55	60	61	40	45	72	65		
MUL	79	65		83	73		69		100		
WHT	74	66	55	80	74	57	64	82	79		
FRL	49	61	55	55	60	42	40	68	68		

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	608
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	41
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	52
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	77
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	71
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	54
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.

Achievement data for Science FCAT - LXMS demonstrated 47% of the students taking the Science FCAT scored between a Level 3-5. Contributing factors included a new teacher to LXMS teaching the 8th grade science course for the first time. The PLC team in 8th grade science had trouble working together. Three of the four teachers wrote a combined 131 discipline referrals. Teachers struggled to build relationships with students.

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

Achievement data for 7th grade Math FSA - In the 17/18 school year LXMS had 77% of the students scored a Level 3-5 and this dropped to 67% of the students scored a Level 3-5 in 18/19. High performing (Level 3-5) 7th grade students were placed in the 8th grade Pre-Algebra and took the 8th grade FSA test. The 7th grade students that took the 7th grade Math FSA were the Level 1-2 students. High performing 6th graders (Level 3-5) took the 7th grade Math FSA test, but struggled in their transition to middle school and the math curriculum.

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.

Achievement data for 6th grade Math FSA - The state Level 3-5 percentage was 55% and LXMS Level 3-5 percentage was 48%. The high performing (Level 3-5) math students in 6th grade were placed in a 7th grade math class and took the 7th Grade Math FSA. The 6th grade math students that took the 6th Grade math FSA were Level 1-2 students.

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

Achievement data in 8th grade Math FSA - In the 17/18 school year LXMS had 41% proficiency (level 3-5) and in the 18/19 school year LXMS had 70% proficiency. The math teachers working with the students pushed them with rigorous coursework and lessons. The Level 3-5 7th grade students took an 8th grade Pre Algebra course and took the 8th grade math FSA and performed well.

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

The main area of focus will be on those students that have previously failed a Math or ELA course. Our goal is to work with the teachers and the students to find out what we need to do to reduce the number of students failing one of these courses.

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

1. FCAT Science
2. Achievement Data for 7th Grade Math FSA
3. Achievement Data for 6th Grade Math FSA
4. Reduce the number of students failing a Math or ELA course

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 areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20. Students with disabilities are performing below the expected score, for sub groups, on standardized testing (below 41% of the students in the subgroup).

Measurable Outcome: Increase the percentage of students with disabilities earning a passing score on standardized tests from 39% to 41% measured by FSA ELA & FSA Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristin Bueno (kristintb@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. Small group instruction (push in and pull out). Professional Development related to increased opportunity for hands on learning and instruction. Increased instructional time with modified scheduling.

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. Formative and Summative data will help identify at risk students as it relates to curriculum based goals. Students have the opportunity to work in small groups to have questions clarified, reteaching, immediate feedback, extended think time. Allowing the staff to better differentiate instruction to meet the needs of the individual students. Working with the students' schedules in order to increase instructional time during the school day has the biggest the impact compared to before or after school programs.

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 Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students and staff need to be present on a consistent basis in order to ensure that learning needs can be met in a supportive and structured classroom environment.

Measurable Outcome: Decrease the % of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 4.35% to 4.0% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2020.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement a school-wide PBIS program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The PBIS program will be utilized to build strong relationships with the students and staff that will track student attendance. The goal of this program will be help students who may struggle with discipline to want to be at school, especially students in our lowest performing ESSA group.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly PD relating to implementation of PBIS for staff.
2. Data review on a routine schedule (PBIS = monthly, Grade Level = weekly, School Social Worker = 2x/quarter, Admin = monthly).
3. Peer led PBIS based video segments (for students).
4. Social Worker contact: phone, mail, home visit, conference, district involvement.
5. Recognition Program for students to identify and reward individuals who make efforts to improve their attendance.
6. Provide supportive intervention for students identified as being at risk for attendance below SIP goal.
7. Closely monitor SWD to increase attendance and learning opportunities.

Person Responsible Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students and staff need to be present on a consistent basis in order to ensure that learning needs can be met in a supportive and structured classroom environment.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of teacher/admin absent 10 or more days from the instructional calendar from 11 to 7 as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Recognition incentive system
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The recognition and incentive system will serve to provide staff with additional motivation to decrease their absences.

Action Steps to Implement

Recognition Program for staff to identify and reward individuals who make efforts to improve their attendance.

Person Responsible Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase appropriate school wide positive behavior support strategies that result in reduction of out of school/internal suspension. Positive preventative systems in place that connects with every student by June 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of OSS from 48 students to 42 students as measured by SESIR reported to District Support Application by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBIS program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBIS program will be utilized to teach and lead behavior in a positive manner.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly PD relating to implementation of PBIS for staff.
2. Daily data review: CASTLE communication data, detentions, referrals, attendance.
3. Peer led PBIS based video segments (for students and staff).
4. Student/Parent/Staff communication.
5. Recognition Program for students to identify and reward individuals who make efforts to improve their behavior.
6. Provide supportive intervention for students identified as being at risk for behavior.

Person Responsible Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/Envision 2030.

Measurable Outcome: Science Achievement from 49% to 58% as measured by FCAT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Formative and Summative assessment based intervention plan. ESSA subgroups will be monitored closely and supports will increase as determined by data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Formative and Summative data will help identify at risk students as it relates to curriculum based goals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Quarterly interventions by subject for at risk students.
2. Quarterly data review (STAR, school-based assessments, District Formatives)
3. School to Parent communication.
4. Classroom recognition and incentives.
5. Closely monitor SWD population and increase supports as data indicates.

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/Envision 2030.

Measurable Outcome: Math Learning Gains from 69% to 70% as measured by FSA and EOC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Formative and Summative assessment based intervention plan. ESSA subgroups will be monitored closely to increase supports as data indicates need. iReady will be implemented to monitor growth and provide differentiation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Formative and Summative data will help identify at risk students as it relates to curriculum based goals. Differentiation opportunities will increase support for at risk student populations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Quarterly interventions by subject for at risk students.
2. Quarterly data review (STAR, iReady, school-based assessments, District Formatives)
3. School to Parent communication.
4. Classroom recognition and incentives.
5. Closely monitor students with disability data and increase support when data indicates.

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

School grade components in alignment with Vision 2020/Envision 2030.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA Learning Gains from 57% to 60% as measured by FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Formative and Summative assessment based intervention plan.
ESSA subgroups will be closely monitored and supports will increase when data indicates need.
Use of iReady to monitor progress and provide differentiation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Formative and Summative data will help identify at risk students as it relates to curriculum based goals. iReady will increase learning opportunities for standards mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Quarterly interventions by subject for at risk students.
2. Quarterly data review (iReady, school-based assessments, District Formatives)
3. School to Parent communication.
4. Classroom recognition and incentives.
5. Closely monitor SWD and increase supports when data indicates a need.

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Leadership team will meet on a quarterly basis in order to address any remaining school wide opportunities.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Teacher Attendance	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00