The School District of Lee County

Diplomat Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Diplomat Middle School

1039 NE 16TH TER, Cape Coral, FL 33909

http://dpm.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Maura Bennington

Start Date for this Principal: 10/26/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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

Diplomat Middle School

1039 NE 16TH TER, Cape Coral, FL 33909

http://dpm.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

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

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 inspire lifelong learning by building character and providing rich academic experiences in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students today. Leaders tomorrow.

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
Bennington, Maura	Principal	The instructional leader of the school.
Toadvine, Caroline	School Counselor	
Villela, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	
Schnabel, Quinn	Teacher, K-12	
Schnabel, Tim	Teacher, K-12	
Dahlburg, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Norris, Tanya	Assistant Principal	
Milstein, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 10/26/2020, Maura Bennington

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.*
19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	255	277	269	0	0	0	0	801
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	14	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	47	38	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	15	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	13	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	51	53	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	49	41	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	44	40	0	0	0	0	113

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	60%	55%	54%	61%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	54%	61%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	44%	47%	48%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	67%	64%	58%	58%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	67%	64%	57%	56%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	51%	47%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	54%	50%	51%	54%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	70%	72%	67%	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	53%	52%	1%	54%	-1%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
	2018	61%	50%	11%	51%	10%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison	-2%					
08	2019	70%	57%	13%	56%	14%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison	6%					
Cohort Comparison	9%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	42%	47%	-5%	55%	-13%
	2018	41%	41%	0%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	64%	57%	7%	54%	10%
	2018	76%	65%	11%	54%	22%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
Cohort Comparison	23%					
08	2019	71%	60%	11%	46%	25%
	2018	47%	47%	0%	45%	2%
Same Grade Comparison	24%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	52%	46%	6%	48%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	49%	48%	1%	50%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	56%	-56%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	67%	9%	71%	5%
2018	72%	66%	6%	71%	1%
Compare		4%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	59%	40%	61%	38%
2018	97%	60%	37%	62%	35%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
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	26	45	40	28	48	40	39	51			
ELL	40	68	61	47	61	56	29	47			
ASN	80	70		89	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	49	58	56	47	51	41	29	73			
HSP	60	63	53	68	68	58	58	71	76		
MUL	59	67		65	61	64	20	93			
WHT	60	59	40	68	67	51	58	76	74		
FRL	54	60	50	59	61	46	48	73	65		

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	24	49	44	34	52	39	22	56			
ELL	21	55	64	34	56	48		60			
ASN	75	75		81	75						
BLK	50	56	56	31	49	47	22	65			
HSP	65	65	56	65	68	49	49	73	67		
MUL	32	39	50	50	54	50		50			
WHT	65	63	49	72	74	61	59	84	70		
FRL	56	58	50	59	66	51	44	70	65		

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	19	45	37	17	45	37	22	28			
ELL	41	66	59	34	57	69		40			
ASN	73	86		73	57						
BLK	40	45	46	39	46	44	57	50	60		
HSP	58	63	54	52	57	49	50	70	60		
MUL	42	62	45	35	28						
WHT	67	62	43	65	59	46	55	70	66		
FRL	55	59	46	52	53	45	53	62	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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	629
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	53
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	79
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	51
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	65
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

6th Grade Math performed the lowest, with 42% scoring at the proficient level. This is only 1 point higher than last year's proficiency level. 20% of our highest performing 6th graders were scheduled into the 7th grade Math course and their proficiency counted for 7th grade. We began the year with our lowest performing students scheduled into the 6th grade Math courses.

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

7th grade math showed the greatest decline from the previous year- 12 points less than last year. The highest performing 7th graders were scheduled into the 8th grade math courses, leaving the lowest performing 7th grade students in 7th grade courses. The proficiency of the high performing students was counted in the 8th grade scores. One important note is that the cohort group raised proficiency from 41% to 64%.

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.

6th grade Math has the biggest gap from the state- 13 points less. There factor here was that our highest performing 7th graders were taking 8th grade courses.

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

8th grade Math had the largest increase from the previous year. The proficiency level jumped from 47% to 71%, due in part that the highest performing 7th graders were in Pre-Algebra. During PLC data chats, teams focused on the test item specs and tested standards to drive instruction. Several

teachers were sent to the Number Lab conference and began to implement new strategies for conceptual learning.

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

Student attendance continues to be an area of concern. We have approximately 36 students whose attendance is below 90%.

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

1. ELA/ Reading proficiency
2. 6th Grade ELA
3. 7th Grade Math
4. 7th grade ELA
5. 8th Grade Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percent of students in grades 6, 7, and 8 who were proficient on the FSA decreased by 3% in 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	Diplomat Middle School will increase the percent of students in grades 6,7,8 scoring at the proficient level on the FSA ELA test from 60% to 64%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Level 1 and 2 students will have reading class every day. Language Live, Inside, iReady and Expert 21 will be the curriculum implemented in each of the reading classes. Use of curriculum maps and/or instructional guides is required at each grade level. Data chats with teachers and PLC time regarding student needs, identifying learning gaps and implementing interventions such as bell ringers, analyzing student work and standards mastery. All academic and elective areas will incorporate two identified LA standards-LAFS.68.RST.2.4 and LAFS.7.RL.1.1- into their daily instruction. Use of iReady for progress monitoring and differentiation to increase proficiency of standards, especially with our lowest performing ESSA subgroups will be utilized and monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers are actively engaging with their students data and the level of mastery for each student, they will be able to catch students and provide intervention immediately. PLC collaboration provides teachers opportunities to discuss their student needs, especially regarding our lowest performing ESSA subgroup. The focus on LAFS standards across all areas will create a common expectation and language across campus. LAFS standards will become a focus campus-wide.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common PLC time
2. Walkthroughs/ observations
3. Monitor iReady data and curriculum based assessment data
4. Monitor lesson plans for ELA activities
5. Vocabulary activities
6. Monitor ESSA subgroup data

Person Responsible	Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although we scored higher than the state and district average, we know our students can reach the 80% on grade level performance.
Measurable Outcome:	Diplomat Middle School will increase the percent of students scoring at or above grade level on the 7th grade Civics EOC from 75% to 80% based on the EOC results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	7th grade Civics course is double blocked, so the teachers will see students everyday. Common planning time will also help Civics teachers dig into the curriculum map, plan the learning calendar and review student data. PLC time will ensure teachers are monitoring the mastery of standards and provide intervention activities as needed. Civics courses will incorporate high yield instructional strategies (higher order questions, distributive summarizing)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Analyzing data to drive instruction is proven to increase mastery of standards to increase student achievement, especially as we target our lowest performing subgroups for ESSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC planning time
2. Walkthroughs/observations
3. Monitor lesson plans for high yield strategies
4. Walkthroughs to provide feedback on classroom activities (are they addressing the standard)
5. Strategic focus on instructional strategies with our lowest performing ESSA subgroup.

Person Responsible Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our students scored 3% higher on the 2019 FSA and we are raising the goal for our 8th graders. We have remained in the 52%-58% range over the last several years.
Measurable Outcome:	Diplomat Middle School will increase the percent of 8th grade students who score proficient, Levels 3-5, on the 8th grade Science FSA from 53% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Science teachers will incorporate ELA standards/focus into their instruction daily. The Science department has identified two important LA standards- LAFS.68.RST.2.4 and LAFS.7.RL.1.1. These two standards were identified as the greatest area of need in ELA and the Science department will use these standards to increase their scores, especially among our lowest performing ESSA subgroup.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using data driven instructional practices through a PLC model will increase opportunities for teachers to share best practices to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Incorporate ADI
2. Quarterly formative assessments
3. Vocabulary strategies
4. Admin to monitor PLC
5. Walkthroughs/observations
6. Close monitoring of lowest performing ESSA subrgroup

Person Responsible Tanya Norris (tanyarn@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student attendance is critical to student learning. Tardiness and absenteeism will greatly impact the achievement of all of our students.
Measurable Outcome:	Diplomat Middle School will decrease the number of chronically absent students (less than 90% attendance) from 13% to 9%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Update parent contact information- phone numbers, email addresses. Increase accuracy of teacher attendance. Teacher/student relationship building. School and parent contact beginning with the 5th absence. Close monitoring of ESSA subgroup.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing student seat time in the classroom has a direct impact on student learning. We want our students to be in class, hearing instruction and engaging in activities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Daily follow up on Focus
2. Follow up with school social worker
3. Admin meeting with repeated absent students
4. Admin meeting with parents of repeated absent students
5. Close monitor of lowest ESSA subgroup to increase support as needed.

Person Responsible Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Keeping students in the classroom or school building has a positive effect on learning, especially with our lowest performing ESSA subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	DMS will decrease the number of unduplicated students receiving oss from 5% to 3.5% as measured by Castle discipline records by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tanya Norris (tanyarn@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop a plan for when students return after serving OSS. More time spent in the classrooms, develop proactive strategies to avoid negative behaviors, build positive relationships between teachers and students. Close monitoring of lowest ESSA subgroup to increase time in class.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive relationships and a proactive approach will give students an opportunity to learn how to avoid negative interactions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide mentorship for younger students
2. Daily contact with students in the EWS
3. Assign adult mentors
4. Review Castle data to monitor effectiveness.
5. Monitor and increase strategies as needed for lowest performing ESSA subgroup.

Person Responsible	Caroline Toadvine (carolinebt@leeschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD will be an area of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for SWD students at Diplomat Middle School. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible	Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will monitor the necessary data to ensure we are moving in a positive direction.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$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: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00