

The School District of Lee County

Fort Myers Middle Academy



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

Fort Myers Middle Academy

3050 CENTRAL AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33901

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

Demographics

Principal: Brian Gibson

Start Date for this Principal: 10/26/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Fort Myers Middle Academy

3050 CENTRAL AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33901

<http://fmm.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;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</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;">89%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a quality learning environment that prepares our students for success in high school, post-secondary education, and future careers. This mission will be accomplished through high expectations, relevant and engaging learning experiences, multiple opportunities to learn, and parental and community involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision, at FMMA, is to ensure each child has the proper foundation towards college and career readiness.

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
Edward, Lynn	Principal	School Instructional Leader
Fitzpatrick, Denise	Assistant Principal	
Peters, John	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/26/2020, Brian Gibson

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	205	196	192	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	34	42	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	38	33	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	1	3	0	0	0	0	33
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	63	57	70	0	0	0	0	190
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	52	56	0	0	0	0	172

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	62	52	64	0	0	0	0	178

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	3	1	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

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	240	209	245	0	0	0	0	694
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	35	47	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	34	34	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	6	8	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	112	127	0	0	0	0	330

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	76	92	105	0	0	0	0	273

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
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	240	209	245	0	0	0	0	694
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	35	47	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	34	34	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	6	8	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	112	127	0	0	0	0	330

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	76	92	105	0	0	0	0	273

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
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	33%	55%	54%	33%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	56%	54%	45%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	44%	47%	36%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	44%	64%	58%	33%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	64%	57%	44%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	54%	51%	53%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	28%	50%	51%	43%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	70%	72%	45%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	27%	52%	-25%	54%	-27%
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	52%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	26%	51%	-25%	52%	-26%
	2018	27%	50%	-23%	51%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	35%	57%	-22%	56%	-21%
	2018	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	43%	47%	-4%	55%	-12%
	2018	27%	41%	-14%	52%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	31%	57%	-26%	54%	-23%
	2018	47%	65%	-18%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	26%	60%	-34%	46%	-20%
	2018	16%	47%	-31%	45%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	26%	46%	-20%	48%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	30%	48%	-18%	50%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	49%	67%	-18%	71%	-22%
2018	51%	66%	-15%	71%	-20%
Compare		-2%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	59%	36%	61%	34%
2018	95%	60%	35%	62%	33%
Compare		0%			

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

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	18	39	47	24	45	52	15	43			
ELL	21	32	21	45	49	38	8	48			
BLK	25	37	37	35	47	45	20	51	52		

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
HSP	39	47	29	53	55	31	28	67	65		
MUL	64			73							
WHT	57	67		63	61		52	71	80		
FRL	31	42	43	41	49	41	23	55	56		
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	18	25	19	18	37	25	15	24			
ELL	20	38	40	41	51	39	21	54			
BLK	24	37	42	27	37	39	23	51	64		
HSP	30	45	22	41	51	53	30	41	73		
WHT	60	43		61	56		57	84			
FRL	31	41	36	36	44	43	30	53	68		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	34	23	11	30	29	30	26			
ELL	13	52	54	37	55	57	18				
BLK	25	36	29	26	41	54	35	36	71		
HSP	36	54	43	37	47	53	48	38	60		
WHT	53	63	60	46	45		60	83			
FRL	31	42	30	30	44	56	40	45	61		

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35

Students With Disabilities	
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	47
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	69
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	64
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	43
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.

7th Grade ELA and 8th Grade Math were both at 26% proficiency tying for the lowest performing data points.

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

7th grade math proficiency showed a decline of 16 percentage points from 2018 to 2019. One of the factors which contributed to this decline is the decrease in 6th grade students being put in to advanced accelerated 7th grade math. This year advanced 6th grade students were placed in advanced 6th grade math verses in 2018 advanced 6th grade students were accelerated to 7th grade math which inflated 7th grade proficiency numbers.

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.

Science proficiency scores had the largest gap when compared to the state average. Factors contributing to this include the 8th grade group of students not having a stable science teacher during 6th and 7th grade.

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

Both math learning gains and proficiency increased 7 percentage points over the previous year. Factors contributing to this increase included reduced class sizes and the addition of a math coach and peer collaborative teacher to offer increased support and professional development for teachers in the math department.

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

Our areas of concern continue to be the large number of students with two or more EWS indicators and the overall number of students scoring a level 1 in reading and/or math.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Science proficiency
3. ELA learning gains
4. Continued progress in math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FMMA is the lowest scoring middle school in the district for Science. We have 4 consecutive years of science deficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase science proficiency from 28% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID High Yield Instructional Strategies (WICOR) and data driven instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All FMMA staff is trained in AVID WICOR. Weekly PD with support and coaching will take place. AVID WICOR will be implemented school wide with fidelity. FMMA is also a school who utilizes the PLC process to drive data driven decisions that will positively impact our lowest performing ESSA subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID summer institute
2. AVID WICOR preschool week
3. Weekly AVID WICOR PD
4. Professional Learning Communities for high yield instruction and assessment strategies
5. Quarterly data chats
6. Close monitoring of ESSA subgroup data to drive decisions.

Person Responsible Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: FMMA has continued to fall well below the district average in ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Increase proficiency from 33% to 50% and increase overall ELA learning gains from 44 to 50% and increase the learning gains of the lowest 25% from 37 to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: AVID High Yield Instructional Strategies (WICOR) and use of iReady to monitor growth and provide differentiation to close achievement gaps, especially with our ESSA subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All FMMA staff is trained in AVID WICOR. Weekly PD with support and coaching will take place. AVID WICOR will be implemented school wide with fidelity. iReady provides an adaptive diagnostic assessment that influences an individualized learning path to target gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID summer institute
2. AVID WICOR preschool week
3. Weekly AVID WICOR PD
4. Professional Learning Communities for high yield instruction and assessment strategies
5. Quarterly data chats
6. Use of iReady diagnostics and learning paths.
7. Closely monitor ESSA subgroup data to inform decisions.

Person Responsible Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus FMMA made solid progress in mathematics achievement last year. We will continue the high yield instructional strategies which contributed to the results and set higher goals for achievement.
Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome: Increase proficiency in mathematics from 44 to 50%. Increase overall learning gains in math from 51 to 55% and increase learning gains of the lowest 25% from 43 to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Denise Fitzpatrick (denise@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: AVID High Yield Instructional Strategies (WICOR). Use of iReady to diagnose, monitor progress, and provide differentiation to close the achievement gaps for our ESSA populations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All FMMA staff is trained in AVID WICOR. Weekly PD with support and coaching will take place. AVID WICOR will be implemented school wide with fidelity. iReady provides three data points which drive instruction and increase supports for our student groups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID summer institute
2. AVID WICOR preschool week
3. Weekly AVID WICOR PD
4. Professional Learning Communities for high yield instruction and assessment strategies
5. Quarterly data chats
6. Use of iReady to drive instruction
7. Closely monitor low performing ESSA subgroup data to inform instructional decisions to increase achievement

Person Responsible Denise Fitzpatrick (denise@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students must be in school to learn.

Measurable Outcome: Student attendance will meet or exceed 95% on SDLC Attendance Cycles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lynn Edward (lynnme@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will individually track own attendance data in AVID binder. Teachers, by subject area, weekly will conduct AVID binder checks to include attendance tracker.

Students who have 95% or higher attendance per quarter will be celebrated. Social worker will meet with student and families to determine support needed.

ESSA subgroups will be closely monitored to increase supports as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students that take ownership of instructional growth, including attending school, are more successful academically.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teach students about research based data as it relates to academic growth and attendance.
2. Instruct how to utilize AVID attendance tracker
3. Teach teachers how to conduct AVID data chats and AVID binder checks
4. Meet with teachers in PLC weekly and discuss attendance concerns.
5. Meet weekly with social worker to discuss students with attendance concerns and strategies that are being used.
6. Closely monitor ESSA subgroups to increase support when data indicates.

Person Responsible Lynn Edward (lynnme@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Students must be in school to learn.

Measurable Outcome: 50% or more of students assigned to the Extended Harbor in lieu of OSS will not have recidivism.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: John Peters (johnmp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Providing students with in school consequences that include instruction on social emotional, community service, small group tutoring, restorative practices will yield fewer discipline incidents.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative practices are researched based and have high yield behavioral change.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create an Extended Harbor to include social emotional/community service/small group tutoring/restorative practices.
2. Create a discipline system that is clear to students and staff that must be followed and include restorative practices.
3. Require teacher/parent communication at each level.
4. Assign students to Extended Harbor in lieu of OSS.
5. Track data.
6. Closely monitor ESSA subgroups to increase supports when data indicates need.

Person Responsible: John Peters (johnmp@leeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Black/African American, ELL and SWD will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20.

Measurable Outcome: Black/African American, ELL and SWD performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lynn Edward (lynnme@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: Lynn Edward (lynnme@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All school-wide improvement priorities are included in the areas of focus.

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