

The School District of Lee County

Mariner Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Mariner Middle School

425 CHIQUITA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

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

Demographics

Principal: Mason Clark

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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	19

Mariner Middle School

425 CHIQUITA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>83%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>51%</p>

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.

The School District of Lee County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Mariner Middle's Mission: Through a challenging educational experience, Mariner Middle School will develop lifelong learners who appreciate differences and create a better and peaceful world through mutual compassion and respect. These ideals will help me on my journey to Determine Who I Become.

Provide the school's vision statement.

District's Vision Statement: The School District of Lee County envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

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
Gould, Rachel	Principal	
Player, Mitchell	Assistant Principal	
Hill, Paula	Teacher, K-12	
McCreary, Alanna	Assistant Principal	
Franklin, Lynann	School Counselor	
Lindmyer, Kim	School Counselor	
Castaldo, Joanne	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/26/2020, Mason Clark

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	245	344	352	0	0	0	0	941
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	32	37	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	9	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	9	8	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	7	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	65	51	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	70	53	0	0	0	0	171

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	42	57	44	0	0	0	0	143

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	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

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	376	371	316	0	0	0	0	1063
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	47	77	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	49	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	49	58	0	0	0	0	157

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	50	49	58	0	0	0	0	157

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
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	376	371	316	0	0	0	0	1063
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	47	77	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	49	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	49	58	0	0	0	0	157

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	50	49	58	0	0	0	0	157

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
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	57%	55%	54%	52%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	54%	56%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	44%	47%	44%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	63%	64%	58%	60%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	62%	64%	57%	63%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	54%	51%	59%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	50%	51%	45%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	70%	72%	73%	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	54%	52%	2%	54%	0%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
	2018	46%	50%	-4%	51%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	58%	57%	1%	56%	2%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	53%	47%	6%	55%	-2%
	2018	39%	41%	-2%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	57%	3%	54%	6%
	2018	63%	65%	-2%	54%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
08	2019	59%	60%	-1%	46%	13%
	2018	44%	47%	-3%	45%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	46%	46%	0%	48%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	48%	6%	50%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	65%	67%	-2%	71%	-6%
2018	58%	66%	-8%	71%	-13%
Compare		7%			

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	97%	59%	38%	61%	36%
2018	96%	60%	36%	62%	34%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	50%	50%	57%	43%
2018	100%	53%	47%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	45	41	29	48	55	20	37			
ELL	36	67	70	51	59	53	14	43	25		

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
ASN	60			70							
BLK	37	53	53	42	50	52	39	42			
HSP	56	65	57	60	62	62	45	64	56		
MUL	52	44		55	57		20				
WHT	60	59	50	67	63	55	53	70	61		
FRL	50	57	53	55	60	58	35	59	46		
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	12	33	37	19	43	47	19	22			
ELL	24	49	47	41	53	46	9	43			
ASN	55	45		67	75						
BLK	28	44	53	26	40	40	41	25			
HSP	49	51	42	56	60	54	42	55	71		
MUL	54	63		54	53		62	73	40		
WHT	58	55	57	66	59	63	67	68	75		
FRL	47	52	48	54	55	52	49	51	70		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	34	32	18	47	54	14	44			
ELL	26	43	44	26	45	50	25				
ASN	62	77		85	83						
BLK	37	43	35	41	53	46	25	87	80		
HSP	47	53	37	48	61	58	38	61	66		
MUL	44	63		60	79		50				
WHT	57	58	49	68	64	61	52	78	73		
FRL	40	47	35	51	60	55	34	66	65		

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	60
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	599
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	49
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	65
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	46
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	60
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	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
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	55
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.

We dropped in science. We knew this would happen because of funding. We had to allocate resources elsewhere so not all students could be double blocked. We have a plan to offset this next year.

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

We dropped in science. We knew this would happen because of funding. We had to allocate resources elsewhere so not all students could be double blocked. We have a plan to offset this next year.

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.

Our gap is in Civics, but we made significant gains. We will continue to double block students who need more support and instruct them on reading in the content area.

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

Our gap is in Civics, but we made significant gains. We will continue to double block students who need more support and instruct them on reading in the content area.

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

Student attendance

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

1. Improve L25 reading
2. Improve L25 math
3. Increase science proficiency
4. Increase student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD will be 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: Rachel Gould (rachelgo@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: Rachel Gould (rachelgo@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students need to be successful in reading and we need to help these students get what they need to be successful.
Measurable Outcome:	Mariner Middle will increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading by 5% as measured by the FSA Reading Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paula Hill (paulamh@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide students specific interventions for their learning needs. Interventions are provided through whole school intervention / enrichment period Students will be scheduled according to there reading needs for example double block civics/science or intensive reading class. SWD will have learning lab time to support reading deficits. Implement iReady for progress monitoring and differentiation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By focusing on student deficits in reading which should close the gap for these students in reading. Identify reading deficits through Castle Standards Tracker, formative assessments, iReady and STAR TAG report.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor Mastery assessments
 2. Continue to develop the Language Live curriculum
 3. L1 and L2 students are double blocked in reading and ELA
 4. Monitor star and iReady progress monitoring
 5. Provide differentiated instruction for each level of student
 6. SWD who have been identified through their IEP will get academic support through a Learning Lab Class.
- Person Responsible** Paula Hill (paulamh@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focusing on the lowest 25% in math will help student be more successful in math.
Measurable Outcome:	Mariner Middle will increase learning gains in the L25 from 57% to 61% as measured on FSA Math Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alanna McCreary (alannalm@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Interventions in math specific to the students learning needs. Intervention is provided through whole school intervention / enrichment period. SWD will have learning lab time to support math deficits Use of iReady to monitor progress and provide differentiation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing students with the skills they have a deficits in, it will strengthen the students deep understanding of math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. daily math intervention time for 30 minutes
2. create a foundations fact fluency group in 6th grade
3. monitor through STAR math and iReady
4. Track formative assessment data (Castle).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We dropped in science. Due to a reallocation of resources, not all students could be double blocked.
Measurable Outcome:	Mariner Middle will increase the 8th grade science proficiency from 48% to 53% as measured on the state assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ben Johnson (benjaminj@leeschools.nete)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are starting the year with a full science teaching staff who will use our intervention period with fidelity. We will monitor formative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Having science certified teachers for a full year will create a strong instructional team

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create formative assessment
2. Schedule science interventions
3. monitor and track data
4. Double block schedule students with disabilities who have been identified as needing more support in science. (4 sections double block scheduled)

Person Responsible Ben Johnson (benjaminj@leeschools.nete)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**School wide mentoring program.
Social worker and teachers working together.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00