



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Three Oaks Middle School

18500 3 OAKS PKWY, Fort Myers, FL 33967

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Forrest Walker**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Three Oaks Middle School

18500 3 OAKS PKWY, Fort Myers, FL 33967

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>52%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>47%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

To provide a quality education in a safe and well managed environment

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Three Oaks Middle School is committed to focus on student achievement strategies that enable all students to meet or exceed rigorous district standards.

### 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
Clark, Mason	Principal	Oversee attendance, behavior, classroom success, operations, and safety for the school.
Barta, Richard	Assistant Principal	Oversee classroom success and safety for the school.
Mount, Carol	Administrative Support	Executive Secretary to the Principal; oversee attendance, behavior, classroom success, operations, and safety for the school.
Rossi, Lillian	School Counselor	School Counselor, A-L, After-school programs.
Doughty, Lynsey	Teacher, ESE	Intervention Support Specialist, Assistant Testing Coordinator
Moore, Christy	Teacher, ESE	ESE Chair
Knecht, James	Teacher, K-12	Restorative Justice Implementation, Corrective Strategies Implementation
Roache, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	Oversee attendance, behavior, and safety for the school.
Hambling, Ryan	Instructional Technology	All things technology and more
Kaczmarek, Michelle	Instructional Coach	0.5 reading coach, 0.5 reading teacher
Brunow, Tom	Other	
Clapood, Julie	School Counselor	
Watkins, Tim	Other	

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Forrest Walker

**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.*

5

**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.*

15



**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

64

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	343	323	336	0	0	0	0	1002
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	16	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	23	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	29	46	0	0	0	0	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	27	42	0	0	0	0	102

**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	16	43	0	0	0	0	84

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	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	0
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	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0
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	64%	55%	54%	64%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	54%	62%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	44%	47%	40%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	72%	64%	58%	74%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	69%	64%	57%	66%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	54%	51%	50%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	69%	50%	51%	62%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	70%	72%	75%	67%	70%

<b>EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey</b>				
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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	65%	52%	13%	54%	11%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
	2018	61%	50%	11%	51%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	71%	57%	14%	56%	15%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

<b>MATH</b>						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	43%	47%	-4%	55%	-12%
	2018	33%	41%	-8%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	72%	57%	15%	54%	18%
	2018	80%	65%	15%	54%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		39%				
08	2019	72%	60%	12%	46%	26%
	2018	52%	47%	5%	45%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	68%	46%	22%	48%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	62%	48%	14%	50%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	73%	67%	6%	71%	2%
2018	72%	66%	6%	71%	1%
Compare		1%			

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	98%	59%	39%	61%	37%
2018	98%	60%	38%	62%	36%
Compare		0%			

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	22	34	30	34	57	54	28	36	40		
ELL	19	39	32	36	57	48	5	26			
ASN	81	70		85	78						

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	50	55	36	62	67	67		50			
HSP	52	52	36	61	62	50	49	61	62		
MUL	78	65		74	74						
WHT	72	62	52	79	73	52	79	82	70		
FRL	50	51	37	58	60	50	53	57	52		
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	22	43	37	24	44	46	22	30			
ELL	12	38	39	24	45	43	14	5			
ASN	86	76		90	81						
BLK	59	46		60	45			91			
HSP	49	53	43	54	58	53	50	58	60		
MUL	86	81		90	76						
WHT	69	62	61	77	67	55	68	80	75		
FRL	51	55	48	58	58	54	52	64	63		
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	36	31	29	47	43	17	24			
ELL	7	30	29	20	36	40		31			
ASN	83	83		89	61						
BLK	53	61	31	55	68	50	38	77			
HSP	51	54	41	59	59	45	47	67	71		
MUL	85	68		89	53						
WHT	71	65	40	82	71	58	72	78	73		
FRL	53	56	39	62	63	51	49	70	63		

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	632
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	69
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	53
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.**

ELA Lowest 25% from 2018-2019 51% to 43%.

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

ELA Lowest 25% from 2018-2019 51% to 43%.

**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.**

ELA Lowest 25% from 2018-2019 51% to 43%.

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

Science overall improved from 62% to 69%.

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

ELA learning gains overall

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

1. ELA lowest 25% percentile
2. ELA overall
- 3 Math



## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

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

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Mason Clark (masonmc@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:** Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Research shows that Staff and student attendance correlates to an increase in academic success.

**Measurable Outcome:** Decrease the percent of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 9% to 8% as measured by the CASTLE Early Warning System by May 2021.

Decrease the number of instructional staff absent 10 or more days from the instructional calendar from 7 to 6 as measured by LMS/Peoplesoft by May 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carol Mount (carolam@leeschools.net)

School Messenger daily callout when a student absence occurs.

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Mrs. Mount, Secretary to the Principal, will review attendance reports from the Information Specialist. The Information Specialist will flag any student with absences of five days. Parent contact will be made by Administration. If absences continue, a referral to the School Social Worker will be made.

Students in low performing subgroups will receive additional supports if data indicates need.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Attendance Reports will be reviewed monthly to determine if more follow up measures are necessary.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review data in EWS
2. Use data to identify students to watch on attendance reports
3. Monitor attendance reports
4. Flag students and have social worker contact parents. Assign mentor to student.
5. Continue to monitor to determine if further action is needed.

**Person Responsible** Lillian Rossi (lillianar@leeschools.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus** Students need to remain in the classroom to receive rigorous instruction with fidelity.  
**Description and Rationale:** Research shows that student time in the classroom correlates to an increase in academic success.

**Measurable Outcome:** Decrease the number of students receiving ISS and/or OSS suspensions from 117 to 90 as measured by SESIR reported to the District Support Application System by May 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lindsey Roache (lindseyro@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Utilization of positive behavior support strategies that will result in a reduction of internal (ISS) and out of school (OSS) suspensions. TOMS uses a discipline card as a warning system to lower the number of discipline referrals and implemented through CASTLE. The discipline card is quarterly step-based with a specific consequences for each step. Corrective Strategies and Interventions Room where students go to discuss their actions and appropriate strategies. All classrooms have student expectations posted.

Use of CASTLE to record positive behavior. Students are recognized weekly and quarterly for positive behavior.  
 Daily Point Sheets are utilized by individual students needing strategies to improve behavior.  
 Students with a PBIP attend a Social/Emotional Skills class to learn strategies. Identified students check in and out with a point person daily.  
 Alternative consequences to suspensions are provided.  
 Community members work with at- risk students on a weekly basis.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** SESIR and CASTLE Reports will be reviewed and discussed with the faculty monthly. Students with strategies and supports can increase learning opportunities by staying in class and in school.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers, Admin, and staff will use PBS strategies in classroom and throughout the school.
2. TOMS expectations will be taught and reinforced throughout the school.
3. TOMS card and TOMS Kudos will be used
4. Procedures for referrals will be followed and conferences with parents will be held when needed
5. Closely monitor data to increase strategies for ELL and SWD populations.

**Person Responsible** Richard Barta (richarddb@leeschools.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students making learning gains in ELA declined from 59% in 2017-2018 to 58% in the 2018-2019 school year. The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students in the Lowest 25 Percentile making learning gains in ELA declined from 51% in 2017-2018 to 43% in the 2018-2019 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:** To increase the number of students making learning gains in ELA from 58% to 62% as measured by the FY21 ELA FSA. Below (1, 2) from 10% to 8%, Proficient (3) from 7% to 9%, Above (4, 5) from 8% to 9%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** ELA reading disaggregated.  
Implementation of iReady program for Reading.  
Each quarter, all content area will have a minimum of three content reading pieces for students to complete.  
Snap and Read will be available for all students this year.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Weekly progress monitoring of formative and summative assessments by teachers. Weekly PLC meetings by departments to analyze data and differentiate instruction. iReady reports and Accelerated Reader will be reviewed quarterly.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. All students receiving reading instruction, even those on grade level
2. Students attend all core subjects daily.
3. All core subjects will be required to have minimum of three reading content pieces per quarter that reinforces reading strategies.
4. Monitor using iReady

**Person Responsible** Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**TOMS will also be looking at the area of Math L25. TOMS is currently using the iReady Program to to guide instruction based on student needs. The program allows students to work independently at their current level to bridge instructional gaps in the learning continuum. It also provides teachers with prescriptive lesson plans for students.**

**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				\$726,952.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
5200	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund	0.6	\$4,250.00	
<i>Notes: Speech Pathologist</i>						
5200	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund	2.0	\$141,674.00	
<i>Notes: Self-contained teachers</i>						

	5200	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund	5.0	\$354,185.00
			<i>Notes: ESE Resource teachers</i>			
	5200	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund	0.89	\$63,044.00
			<i>Notes: 2 ESE Helping Teacher</i>			
	5200	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund	1.34	\$94,921.00
			<i>Notes: ESE Inclusion Paraprofessional</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund	0.45	\$31,593.00
			<i>Notes: ESOL paraprofessional</i>			
	5100	311-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund		\$29,285.00
			<i>Notes: Extended Day tutoring from SAI funds. This tutoring is open to all, but ESE and ELL students encouraged to attend.</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund		\$8,000.00
			<i>Notes: Action Force Plan--provides for compensation for remediation during their planning periods. Six weeks, starting Quarter 3. Open to all, but targeting L25, ESE, and ELL Students.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Student Attendance</b>				<b>\$2,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	300-Purchased Services	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Tentative: Working with the School Advisory Council to identify needs of our non-English speaking parents. Planning to have some parents "academies" in Spanish to welcome them to the school and to teach them more about our school system. This amount pending topic identification and SAC approval</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Discipline</b>				<b>\$73,337.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	311-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Safe Schools Funding. Used to provide after-school detention as well as Saturday School to avoid student absences</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund	1.0	\$70,837.00
			<i>Notes: budgeted 1 Corrective Strats and Interventions teacher for PBIS and Restorative Justice Support.</i>			
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$35,418.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	100-Salaries	0821 - Three Oaks Middle School	General Fund	0.5	\$35,418.00
			<i>Notes: 0.5 Reading Coach</i>			

	<b>Total:</b> <b>\$848,207.00</b>
--	-----------------------------------