

The School District of Lee County

Bonita Springs Middle Center For The Arts



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	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Bonita Springs Middle Center For The Arts

10141 W TERRY ST, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

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

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Layner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Bonita Springs Middle Center For The Arts

10141 W TERRY ST, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

<http://bnm.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	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

School Grades History

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

Expanding Minds, Strengthening Bodies, Nurturing Souls for Career and College-Ready Success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building a Community of Career and College-Ready Learners through Academics and the Arts

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
Layner, Melissa	Principal	Handles all operational and educational duties, to include budget, discipline, curriculum, and community involvement.
Cooke, Jill	Assistant Principal	Scheduling and Curriculum
Lightfoot, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Transportation, Discipline and Operations
Bonnell, Jill	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Smyrnios, Misty	Teacher, K-12	Testing Coordinator, Instructional Coach and ELA Department Head
Leskin, Karen	Teacher, ESE	ESE Reading Teacher and School Improvement Plan guide
Schwinghamer, Jeremy	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Coach and Administrative Liaison

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Melissa Layner

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	267	286	276	0	0	0	0	829	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	18	0	0	0	0	40	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	10	0	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	2	7	0	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	1	9	0	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	65	64	0	0	0	0	169	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	45	35	0	0	0	0	120	

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	43	38	37	0	0	0	0	118	

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	
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	289	315	324	0	0	0	0	928	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	31	39	0	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	23	0	0	0	0	50	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	105	84	0	0	0	0	263	

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	80	85	100	0	0	0	0	265	

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	289	315	324	0	0	0	0	928
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	31	39	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	23	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	105	84	0	0	0	0	263

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	80	85	100	0	0	0	0	265

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	55%	55%	54%	57%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	54%	62%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	44%	47%	46%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	68%	64%	58%	66%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	66%	64%	57%	67%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	54%	51%	49%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	50%	51%	47%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	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	51%	52%	-1%	54%	-3%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	44%	51%	-7%	52%	-8%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	51%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	55%	57%	-2%	56%	-1%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	63%	47%	16%	55%	8%
	2018	53%	41%	12%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	57%	2%	54%	5%
	2018	62%	65%	-3%	54%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	47%	60%	-13%	46%	1%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	45%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	42%	46%	-4%	48%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	48%	3%	50%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	67%	67%	0%	71%	-4%
2018	70%	66%	4%	71%	-1%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	59%	39%	61%	37%
2018	97%	60%	37%	62%	35%
Compare		1%			
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	24	44	35	33	54	57	12	44	47		
ELL	26	40	29	44	51	47	16	42	59		
ASN	87	71		93	93						

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	62	58		62	68						
HSP	46	50	34	59	59	49	31	66	70		
MUL	80			100							
WHT	72	68	40	87	80	63	69	92	83		
FRL	48	51	35	62	63	54	32	67	71		
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	15	32	21	27	45	46	11	55			
ELL	12	32	29	26	53	56	15	45			
ASN	93	67		100	80						
BLK	70	65		67	55						
HSP	43	47	32	55	59	56	38	68	69		
MUL	58	55		83	91						
WHT	76	69	38	82	73	48	81	89	94		
FRL	47	49	31	57	60	56	46	71	74		
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	12	40	35	27	46	37	14	22			
ELL	17	47	46	34	55	54	4	38			
ASN	86	93		86	85						
BLK	50	47		63	87						
HSP	46	57	47	57	61	48	38	55	74		
MUL	62	62		77	77						
WHT	78	70	35	84	79	57	66	86	91		
FRL	46	56	43	58	61	46	37	56	75		

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	57
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
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	86
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	63
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	51
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	90
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	73
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.

Overall L25 ELA data was a very weak area for us, scoring below 41%. We saw an increased number of ELL students non-proficient verbally and written in their native dialect and in English. Lack of instructional resources for our monolingual students was also a challenge, but has since been corrected. .

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

8th grade Science fell nine percentage points. Based on the 2018, we adjusted our Science instructional plan to include standards-based instruction through weekly spiralization to include reteaching and retesting. We were not doing this previously.

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.

Seventh grade ELA data was our lowest performance area. Traditionally, our seventh graders do take a dip, often tied to motivational issues.

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

Sixth grade math made a 10 percentage-point growth. We added one strong teacher to this grade level and all of the teachers had very tight curriculum.

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

We want to address our overall number of level one students, many of whom are not identified SWD or ELL. The quantity of students below the 90% attendance rate is another concerning area.

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

1. Improve L25 learning gains in ELA and Math
2. Increase overall ELA proficiency
3. Increase 8th grade Science performance
4. Continue positive attendance trends

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data showed a disparity in Science achievement between state and district averages; we experienced a nine point drop from the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, our eighth grade students will show 50% achievement on the Science State Assessment as measured by the Science Assessment scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Cooke (jillmco@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction with intervention class for all 8th grade students Authentic Learning Units, ADI, common formative assessments PLC's Curriculum maps and instructional guides for pacing District progress monitoring through Unify with standards based data analysis for reteach and support Strategic placement of students from our ESE and LY (ESSA) subgroups with additional support tracks and purposeful grouping
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Some of these strategies are research-based and previously used, showing success. We also did a comparison to district practices to see what professional development might be available to our teachers. In addition, our 8th grade teachers will be using in class formatives and district progress monitoring through Unify to assess standards based needs for remediation and enrichment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a curriculum based on standards by grade level
2. Create a pacing guide/reference district curriculum map and instructional guide
3. Department wide training/PD
4. Continuous monthly monitoring through formatives and district progress monitoring through Unify
5. After school free tutoring
6. Mandatory iReady reading paths to support comprehension

Person Responsible Jill Cooke (jillmco@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of

Focus

Description and

Rationale:

ESSA Subgroup data and minimal gains for L25 students show a need for increased intervention in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

During the 2020-2021 school year, our L25 students in Math will increase from 52% to 57% learning gains as measured by the FSA Math in May of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Lightfoot (christopherml@leeschools.net)

Evidence- based Strategy:

AVID strategies, Peer collaborative teams, and Differentiated instruction based on standards-based instruction following the district curriculum maps, professional development for teachers focused on differentiation strategies, model classrooms for teacher observation of differentiated learning stations and implementation of iReady.

Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:

These resources are readily available and proven to work with subgroups such as our ESE students and ELL students (ESSA sub-group).

Action Steps to Implement

1. AVID training schoolwide
2. iReady training during preschool week
3. School grade and data presentations from school district office
4. Differentiation plan based on district curriculum maps
5. Professional development for differentiation instructional strategies
6. Model classrooms for teachers to observe differentiation learning stations
7. Progress monitoring through iReady math and STAR for Algebra and Geometry

Person Responsible

Christopher Lightfoot (christopherml@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: The five-year trend in ELA achievement has declined or shown only slight improvement.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2020-2021 school year, our school will increase from 55% to 60% ELA proficiency rate as measured by the May 2021 FSA Reading scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Layner (melissaal@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use of Language-Live, Inside, iReady, and Expert 21 leveled reading curriculum; level 2 students will go to advanced curriculum in 8th grade; standards-based instruction as aligned with the district curriculum maps; double-blocked (increased seat time) classes. ELL and ESE students receive additional instruction in critical thinking classes. ELL students with no FSA scores are tracked into Everyday English for additional support in language acquisition.

Rationale for

Evidence-based Strategy: Trend data has shown little improvement in ELA over the past five years.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategic teacher and student scheduling
2. ELL training for instruction and culture
3. Rigorous strategies to include RACE, Close Reads, and WICOR
4. ELL and ESE student intervention by ELA teacher, Reading teacher, and Critical thinking teacher
5. After school free tutoring
6. Mandatory Accelerated Reading for a Reading practice grade.
7. Classroom Instruction to follow district curriculum maps by learning standards
8. iReady training for progress monitoring and differentiation opportunities

Person Responsible Melissa Layner (melissaal@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Reducing the amount of time students are placed in In-School Suspension, which will increase the time they are in class learning. If students are removed for an extended period of time from their general education classrooms, they are not receiving the instruction needed to be proficient in their core academic classes. In FY 18-19, our school had 208 instances of In-School Suspension(ISS), which equates to 23% of students, which will be reduced to 17%, which would lessen the number of students having one instance of more of ISS by 48 students.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2020-2021 school year, we will decrease the percentage of students receiving one or more In-School suspensions from 22% to 17% as measured by the District Support Application System by June of 2020.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Lightfoot (christopherml@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through the use of de-escalation strategies paired with a multifaceted restorative practice approach, which will be used to re-teach appropriate behavior, actions, and responses to adults and peers. Moreover, the use of after-school detention as an intervention for specific behaviors will have second step lessons that focus on Social-Emotional Learning to aide in the reduction of behaviors that disrupt/interrupt the learning environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Many students receiving suspensions are academically at-risk and are missing instructional time through suspensions. This also greatly impacts are ability to close the gaps with our lowest performing ESSA subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will receive virtual Saturday school and alternative-to-suspension assignments for minor referrals.
2. Proper tracking of student consequences in the CASTLE and FOCUS Discipline Management system.
3. School-wide professional development on restorative discipline practices.

Person Responsible Christopher Lightfoot (christopherml@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Focus Description and Rationale: Having a staff member on-site four days per week to focus on attendance and family needs ensure that families feel valued from the school and allows the school to have the resources needed to contact all chronically absent students' families.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2020-2021 school year, we will decrease the percentage of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 12% to 11% as measured by the Focus Excessive Absence Report by June of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jill Cooke (jillmco@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The call log and daily attendance reports will be monitored to ensure families of chronically absent students, especially students in our lowest ESSA subgroups, are being notified and assisted in any way possible.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The daily attendance report and the call log generated by the school social worker are the most accurate means available to track chronically absent students and our follow-up with those students' families. This along with the end-of-the-year percentage generated in SESIR will determine the effectiveness of our strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. A social worker is on-site 4 days per week and contacting every family of chronically absent students and students that are at risk of being chronically absent and documenting those contacts in a call log.
2. When appropriate, meetings will be set-up with families to discuss possible solutions to their student's excessive absenteeism.
3. The administration will also monitor the daily attendance reports to assist in identifying absentee patterns and trends.
4. Students chronically absent from Lee Home Connect will conduct home visits, with the option to refer students to Face-to-Face instruction if the need arises.

Person Responsible Jill Cooke (jillmco@leeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELL and SWD will be an area of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY21.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Layner (melissaal@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for ELL and SWD students at Bonita 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: Melissa Layner (melissaal@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In support of ELA achievement, the Science department is planning to employ research-based practices reading improvement (close reads).

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