North Fort Myers Academy For The Arts

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

North Fort Myers Academy For The Arts

1856 ARTS WAY, North Fort Myers, FL 33917

http://nfa.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Andrew Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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

North Fort Myers Academy For The Arts

1856 ARTS WAY, North Fort Myers, FL 33917

http://nfa.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)
Combination School PK-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	45%

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.

Academics and Arts for lifelong learning in a safe and caring environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a world class academic and arts school.

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
Gunns, Andrea	Principal	
Marks, Joy	Assistant Principal	
Carley, Yasmin	Teacher, K-12	
Carrigan, Mariella	Teacher, K-12	
Froehlich, Peter	Teacher, K-12	
Jamison, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	
Sherman, Laura	Instructional Coach	
West Taylo, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	
Maxwell, Jan	School Counselor	
Taylor, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	
Bregenzer, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	
Turbeville, Missy	Assistant Principal	
	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Andrew Miller

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
27

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 11/6/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	63%	62%	61%	62%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	60%	59%	59%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	53%	54%	44%	51%	51%
Math Achievement	67%	62%	62%	66%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	59%	62%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	49%	52%	49%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	54%	56%	58%	45%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	78%	78%	80%	65%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**									**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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**
03	2019	72%	58%	14%	58%	14%
	2018	73%	55%	18%	57%	16%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	55%	13%	58%	10%
	2018	70%	53%	17%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
	2018	78%	52%	26%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
06	2019	54%	52%	2%	54%	0%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	-24%					
07	2019	59%	51%	8%	52%	7%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	51%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	11%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					
08	2019	60%	57%	3%	56%	4%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison	12%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	79%	61%	18%	62%	17%
	2018	69%	58%	11%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison	10%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	62%	13%	64%	11%
	2018	72%	58%	14%	62%	10%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	75%	58%	17%	60%	15%
	2018	72%	57%	15%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	21%	47%	-26%	55%	-34%
	2018	33%	41%	-8%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
07	2019	65%	57%	8%	54%	11%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	54%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				
08	2019	69%	60%	9%	46%	23%
	2018	56%	47%	9%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	55%	50%	5%	53%	2%
	2018	64%	52%	12%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	47%	46%	1%	48%	-1%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	50%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

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	75%	67%	8%	71%	4%
2018	69%	66%	3%	71%	-2%
Compare	6%				

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	92%	59%	33%	61%	31%
2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
Compare		-8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
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	22	31	22	35	47	39	28	36			
ELL	37	45	42	46	58	50	27				
BLK	62	62	38	51	49	38	40				
HSP	61	50	36	65	61	51	46	85	38		
MUL	45	43		52	50		33				
WHT	65	55	30	71	64	41	60	76	65		
FRL	53	48	32	59	56	40	43	74	44		
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	27	35	39	34	42	31	26	52			
ELL	39	52	57	52	58	54	40				
BLK	55	49	40	57	50	20					
HSP	63	51	52	66	58	52	52	71	79		
MUL	50	44		57	53	23	55	64			
WHT	66	51	38	70	61	42	68	71	79		
FRL	58	47	43	63	56	46	58	66	79		
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	30	39	31	32	54	38	26	38			
ELL	39	45	43	64	71	62					

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
ASN	90			100							
BLK	50	32	20	56	61	60	39				
HSP	62	62	48	63	62	45	57	81	64		
MUL	61	52		58	67						
WHT	63	60	42	69	63	50	60	79	75		
FRL	56	53	41	62	58	46	50	76	60		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	565
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	46
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	55
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	45
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	59
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	51
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.

The data indicates that in Elementary and 6th grade ELA show the lowest performance. Algebra and Geometry EOC data indicates a decrease in performance. Contributing factors were new instructional plans and a need for more focused interventions.

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

Fifth grade ELA and Sixth grade math indicates the largest decline. In Fifth Grade, the team was new together and the Read 180 curriculum was new to the teachers. More focus on instruction and standards is needed. In Sixth grade math the standards need to be focused on and remediation for students to build mastery.

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.

Sixth grade math indicates the greatest gap as compared to the state average with a 34% decrease. The contributing factors to the decline are the new plan for math instruction and PLC dialogue and plan for implementation, lack of math facts and concepts.

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

Math in elementary and 7th/8th grades indicated the most growth. As a school, we focused on math standards, instruction and plans. We utilized PLC collaboration and data analysis to focus on mastery of the standards.

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

Attendance-tardies and leaving school early by some students chronically.

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

1. Increase ELA proficiency school-wide.
2. Decrease the gap in the lowest 25% in ELA.
3. Increase proficiency in Algebra and Geometry.
4. Decrease chronic students from tardies and being dismissed early.
5. Decrease behavioral referrals

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2018-2019 school year, NFMAA decreased in Science school-wide by 9% going from 61% to 52%.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2019-2020, school year NFMAA will increase science achievement from 52% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Gunns (andrealg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are working with the district support teachers to come and provide professional development to teachers K-8th grade. Grade level and departments will analyze data to identify standards to remediate and enrich. ELA teachers will utilize science vocabulary during lessons to build mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing instruction based on the science standards and providing teachers professional development in Science will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze assessment data
2. Identify standards and needs of students.
3. Integrate Science vocabulary into ELA block.
4. Monitor progress through formative assessments

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math data indicates a decrease in achievement from 68% to 67% school-wide .Students in the lowest 25% in Math increased from 43%to 44%, however this is still 5% below the trend for the past 2 years.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2019-2020 school year, the Math achievement will increase from 67% to 72% on the Math FSA. The lowest 25% of students making learning gains at NFMAA on the FSA will increase from 44% to 49% on the Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Gunns (andrealg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	At NFMAA in grades K-8, we will utilize backward design standards based common planning, high yield strategies to improve the instruction, and quarterly data chats with teachers on student progress. In addition, we will utilize district math support to work with our teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting these strategies is to improve instruction in the classroom and provide opportunities for students to master the standards in math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Grade Level/Department Common Planning based on students' needs and standards.
2. Teacher data chats/planning after each quarterly STAR Reading administration.
3. Interventions for standards-based mastery
4. District Support in classrooms with an instructional focus
5. Data Walls to be accessed consistently throughout the school year.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2018-2019 school year, the achievement level in ELA decreased by 1% going from 64% to 63%, the lowest 25% of students at NFMAA making learning gains decreased from 43% to 32% on the ELA FSA.This decline has been atrend for the past 3 years.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2019-2020 school year, the lowest 25% of students at NFMAA Increase ELA proficiency school-wide from 32%to 45% on the ELA FSA in May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Gunns (andrealg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In Elementary, K-5 teams will administer diagnostics after each Early STAR/STAR Reading and identify standards that need to be mastered. Each team will meet with elementary administration to set goals for students and develop grade level intervention/enrichment plans for students. As a team, after each administration of STAR students will be moved on the data wall. Students will be monitored during data PLC meetings to analyze if the intervention is working , if students are able to move to their next skill, or need a different modification.Teachers will set goals for students to move after each STAR. Administration will monitor "What I need now"(WINN) time closely by classroom walk-thru 's and follow-up discussions with individual teachers and teams will occur. In Middle School, Teachers will have common planning and will analyze STAR Results, formative assessments, and summative assessments. They will drill down based on TAG reports to focus on standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will provide students the researched based practice to master skill and fill in gaps in the students achievement.These strategies will provide understanding, mastery, accountability, and support for mastery of standards. Resources utilized are STAR to monitor progress and district formative assessments. Teachers will utilize Really Great Reading Company, Step by Step Learning, Read 180, USA Test Prep, and Inside.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC common standards-based planning and data analysis sessions
2.Teacher data chats with admin on each student and plan for their success.
3. Analyze District Formative Assessments and Summative Assessments K-8.
4. Monitor through the ELA STAR quarterly.
5.Focus on instruction and integrating High Yield Strategies with a focus on grade level attention to instructional domains.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2018-2019 school year, our referral rate decreased by 66% from the prior year. This was as a result of behavioral interventions, such as, the dragon card, communication with parents, and administration clear expectations.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2019-2020 school year, we will reduce referrals by 20% from 2018-2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Gunns (andrealg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase preventative behaviors, provide replacement behaviors for students, teach social skills and provide professional development to teachers on restorative practices and Growth Mindset.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for the strategies is to be proactive by teaching teachers and student about behavior and continuous growth to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD on restorative practices and Growth Mind Set with teachers and staff.
2. Provide preventative grade level social skills classes.
3. Implement Zones of behavior for our Behavioral Classes and students who would benefit .
4. Provide after-school behavioral classes for designated students as needed.
5. Re-implement PBIS practices school-wide.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2018-2019, NFMAA the daily average attendance for students coming in tardy was 10% of 180 days of school and the daily average attendance of students who left early was 10 % of 180 days of school.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2019-2020 school year, NFMAA will decrease the daily tardy attendance and students leaving early from of school by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Gunns (andrealg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are utilizing the Keeping Track System to monitor students who are coming in late and leaving early. We are monitoring this data at beginning of the day and hourly. We are also improving our monitoring of student attendance of tardies and early sign outs. We are increasing teacher, social worker, and administrative communication regarding attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to raise student achievement students need to be at school on time and stay all day.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize Keeping Track to monitor student tardiness
2. Phone calls by teachers and social worker to get students to school on time and to keep them from leaving early.
3. Parent Conferences with parents, social worker, guidance and administration.
4. PBIS Strategies for attendance.
5. Administration visibility on campus at the beginning and end of the day to welcome student and parents.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We are utilizing our Positive Behavior Support (PBS) certificates, dragon diamonds, and other incentives to increase attendance and decrease early sign outs. We will also, work with PTO and individual parents to create a plan for improvement.

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.

We build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through communication PTO/SAC/Arts Foundation meetings, curriculum nights for each grade K-8. We sharing and analyze data for all student groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, migrant, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically underserved, identifying school needs. We share these results and our plan of action at our SAC Meetings. We also have an ESOL night for ESOL Parents to help them understand the curriculum and provide them support. Stakeholders will participate through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, personal phone call, transportation, and flexible meetings to share student progress and address concerns. We invite parent and community volunteers to work with our teacher's students in the classrooms. We also mentor college interns in our classrooms. We enlist community/business partners through collaborative partnerships. We have an Arts Foundation which is a collaboration of teachers, parents, and community partners. We also are involved in arts in the district and community by having our students involved in giving back. NFMAA partners with the Rotary Club, Kiwanis, and the Piper Center. We have architects come in and work with our 4th/5th grade students. The Barbara B. Mann is another business partner. We also partner with Five Guys, Chic Filet, and Chipotle. All of the parents, teachers, staff, students, community and business create a very supportive culture at NFMAA.

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
		Total:	**$0.00**