The School District of Lee County

Estero High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Estero High School

21900 RIVER RANCH RD, Estero, FL 33928

http://est.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Michael Amabile

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	64%
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 (59%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: C (52%) 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

Estero High School

21900 RIVER RANCH RD, Estero, FL 33928

http://est.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)
High School 9-12	No	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

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 mission of Estero High School is to provide each member of our diverse student body with the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in an increasingly complex world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Estero High School is where students come to learn and leave to succeed.

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
Amabile, Mike	Principal	
Davie, Kristin	Assistant Principal	
Morse, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Baird, Cassie	Teacher, K-12	
Stitgen, Ben	Teacher, K-12	
Houghton, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Heyboer, Norm	Teacher, K-12	
Howdyshell, David	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/14/2019, Michael Amabile

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.*
1

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
55

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	64%
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 (59%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: C (52%) 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	336	309	314	344	1303
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	22	18	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	25	18	67
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	25	17	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	29	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	34	39	40	176
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	30	41	44	158

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	36	33	37	42	148

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	4	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	323	349	473	439	1584
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	23	65	88	207
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	19	65	44	166
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	37	64	38	191
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	69	106	48	294

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	52	33	75	54	214

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	2	2
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	323	349	473	439	1584
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	23	65	88	207
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	19	65	44	166
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	37	64	38	191
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	69	106	48	294

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	52	33	75	54	214

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	2	2
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	67%	55%	56%	58%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	49%	51%	43%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	37%	42%	26%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	56%	50%	51%	49%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	41%	45%	48%	29%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	43%	45%	28%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	62%	68%	67%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	67%	73%	80%	63%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	66%	51%	15%	55%	11%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	53%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	68%	48%	20%	53%	15%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	56%	17%	67%	6%
2018	70%	61%	9%	65%	5%
Compare		3%			

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	64%	11%	70%	5%
2018	71%	62%	9%	68%	3%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	35%	59%	-24%	61%	-26%
2018	38%	60%	-22%	62%	-24%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	50%	15%	57%	8%
2018	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
Compare		8%			

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	25	19	21	27	28	21	39		95	28
ELL	33	40	30	21	35	27	30	32		80	42
ASN	94	53		64	36		100	92			
BLK	64	82		40			50				
HSP	53	41	31	34	35	31	56	62		93	54
MUL	94	36		58	27		91				
WHT	72	49	33	69	45	44	81	84		97	69
FRL	54	38	32	43	37	37	60	68		92	50

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	44	42	20	56	62	32	32		76	32
ELL	7	36	37	21	35	35	21	32		44	18
ASN	88	67		92	40			85			
BLK	58	47		36	38					91	80
HSP	49	51	37	40	37	45	58	59		81	56
MUL	73	45									
WHT	76	61	55	70	45	59	81	80		96	65
FRL	56	55	41	50	43	54	63	63		84	52

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	23	20	12	26	30	36	21	45		68	24
ELL	8	27	29	25	31	36	33	36		65	20
ASN	70	55		76	55			86			
BLK	71	41		38	19						
HSP	41	32	23	34	23	26	50	71		84	44
MUL	47	27		53	46						
WHT	68	50	32	57	32	29	78	86		94	64
FRL	46	36	27	39	27	30	56	69		83	44

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	58
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	642
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
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	38
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	73
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	59
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	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students 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	64
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.

ELA, Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance. The majority of the students that fell in this group were placed in a classroom that was not staffed with a consistent teacher throughout the school year. By the time the students took the FSA, the students were working with their fourth teacher. The inconsistency was detrimental to the learning environment for these students. Despite the challenges in the classroom, the data was just 3% below the district average in the same area, showing that students in our district struggled with ELA performance.

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

Math, Lowest 25th Percentile, showed the greatest decline. One of the factors that could have contributed to this was that many students were scheduled for Liberal Arts math in 2017-2018 prior to taking Algebra 1 in 2018-2019. Many of these student took and passed the PERT to achieve a concordant score for the Algebra 1 EOC during 2017-2018. When taking the Algebra 1 EOC, these students had already met their graduation requirement. This factor of already achieving success could have contributed to the decline in the Lowest 25th Percentile students making learning gains. In addition, the district curriculum maps and formative assessments that were being utilized to guide the instruction were revamped prior to this school year. This shift in sequence and focus of assessment could have also contributed to the decline in the Lowest 25th Percentile students making learning gains, due to the fact that teachers had to adapt and reformulate their instructional plan at the beginning and middle of the 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.

Math, Lowest 25th Percentile, showed the greatest decline. One of the factors that could have contributed to this was that many students were scheduled for Liberal Arts math in 2017-2018 prior to taking Algebra 1 in 2018-2019. Many of these student took and passed the PERT to achieve a concordant score for the Algebra 1 EOC during 2017-2018. When taking the Algebra 1 EOC, these students had already met their graduation requirement. This factor of already achieving success could have contributed to the decline in the Lowest 25th Percentile students making learning gains. In addition, the district curriculum maps and formative assessments that were being utilized to guide the instruction were revamped prior to this school year. This shift in sequence and focus of assessment could have also contributed to the decline in the Lowest 25th Percentile students making learning gains, due to the fact that teachers had to adapt and reformulate their instructional plan at the beginning and middle of the year.

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

The most improvement was made in Science Achievement. Teachers implemented a new curriculum guide and incorporated more hands-on labs. Data was discussed during weekly PLC time to drive instructional decisions, and quarterly data chats were held with students to track their progress. USA Testprep was implemented as a resource to extend learning. Assessments were made more rigorous by adding and balancing higher level questioning to align with the DOK levels of the state standards.

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

Attendance is an area of concern.

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

1. Math, Lowest 25th Percentile
2. ELA, Lowest 25th Percentile
3. ELA Learning Gains
4. Math Achievement
5. Math Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance was chosen as an area of focus because of a high amount of student attendance below 90 percent.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to decrease the student absences below 90 percent by 11 students for the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Morse (heathernm@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy that we will continue to use will be the use of attendance contracts through our school-based social worker. We formed an attendance committee comprised of Social Worker, two assistant principals, SRO, Guidance Counselor, three teachers, information specialist, and attendance secretary that will meet monthly to focus on keeping student attendance above 90% as a school, and then focusing on individual students with attendance issues.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is that we have documentation of the meeting and next steps if student attendance does not improve.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure accurate attendance.
2. Ensure attendance contracts are set-up and followed.

Person Responsible	Heather Morse (heathernm@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Behavior was chosen as an area of focus due to the number of students receiving In-School Suspension (ISS) throughout the 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to reduce the number of In-School Suspensions by 10% for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Davie (kristinld@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Estero High School will conduct various trainings to improve classroom management through the year. Some of the trainings will include a focus on classroom management, and KAGAN and AVID strategies. The administration team will also implement restorative justice practices when addressing student behaviors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The AVID and KAGAN strategies have been proven to increase classroom engagement, leading to lower numbers of classroom management issues. In order to ensure a change, Estero High School will review discipline procedures through the school year based on the data from District Support Applications.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff trainings based on classroom management and student engagement strategies.
2. Restorative justice practices (For example, instead of issuing the student a day of ISS for a no-show discipline referral, we will issue the student a cell phone contract. Other restorative practice will be put in to place as well).

Person Responsible	Kristin Davie (kristinld@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math, bottom 25%, was chosen as a classroom performance goal due to the decline in achievement percentage from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Estero High School will increase the bottom 25% learning gains for Math for the 2020-2021 school year by 3 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Howdyshell (davidjh@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Estero High School will implement instructional strategies aligned with the school district curriculum maps to target student learning goals identified by STAR testing, district formative assessments, and subject area common assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Estero High School will use a comprehensive assessment plan that measures student learning from broad-scale with the STAR assessment to individual standard need on daily common assessments. The instructional staff will use the data collected from the comprehensive assessment plan to select appropriate instructional resources from the school district curriculum map. The curriculum maps have been created by the School District of Lee County to align with Vision 2030 Standards. Using student data, teachers will determine which individual Math Standards will become focus areas for their students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will identify their bottom 25 students in each class and review data and IEP goals to determine areas of need.
2. Teacher lesson plans will include differentiation strategies for students that have learning or language barriers.
3. Teachers will create and utilize scaffolding structures to allow the bottom 25 to reach a higher conceptual understanding.
4. Targeting students in our bottom 25 for small group instruction (Bootcamp pull-out).
5. Instead of detention for minor discipline infractions, students will be referred to a tutoring session.
6. Students with IEP or ELL designations or students labeled as the bottom 25 will receive additional support in the classroom from teachers and paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible	David Howdyshell (davidjh@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	English Learning Gains was chosen as a classroom performance goal due to the decline in achievement percentage from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Estero High School will raise their English Learning Gains for the 2020-2021 school year by 3 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Davie (kristinld@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will incorporate the use of STAR testing to measure and monitor student proficiency and growth within the classroom. Teachers will also utilize curriculum maps within the classroom. Formative Assessments are administered two times a quarter, and USA Testprep will be utilized incorporated within the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The STAR test is used at Estero High School to monitor student growth and determine need for individual students. The curriculum maps have been created by the School District of Lee County to align with Vision 2030 Standards. Using student data, teachers will determine which individual ELA Standards will become focus areas for their students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher lesson plans will include differentiation strategies for students that have learning or language barriers.
2. Teachers will plan test prep based on individual student needs.
3. Teachers will identify their bottom 25 students in each class and review data and IEP goals to determine areas of need.
4. Students with IEP or ELL designations or students labeled as the bottom 25 will receive additional support in the classroom from teachers and paraprofessionals.
5. Teachers will create and utilize scaffolding structures to allow the bottom 25 to reach a higher conceptual understanding.

Person Responsible	Kristin Davie (kristinld@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	English, bottom 25%, was chosen as a classroom performance goal due to the decline in achievement percentage from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Estero High School will increase the bottom 25% learning gains for English for the 2020-2021 school year by 3 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Davie (kristinld@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will incorporate the use of STAR testing to measure and monitor student proficiency and growth within the classroom. Teachers will also utilize curriculum maps within the classroom. Formative Assessments are administered two times a quarter, and USA Testprep will be utilized incorporated within the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The STAR test is used at Estero High School to monitor student growth and determine need for individual students. The curriculum maps have been created by the School District of Lee County to align with Vision 2030 Standards. Using student data, teachers will determine which individual ELA Standards will become focus areas for their students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher lesson plans will include differentiation strategies for students that have learning or language barriers.
2. Teachers will plan test prep based on individual student needs.
3. Teachers will identify their bottom 25 students in each class and review data and IEP goals to determine areas of need.
4. Students with IEP or ELL designations or students labeled as the bottom 25 will receive additional support in the classroom from teachers and paraprofessionals.
5. Teachers will create and utilize scaffolding structures to allow the bottom 25 to reach a higher conceptual understanding.

Person Responsible	Kristin Davie (kristinld@leeschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners students will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY19.
Measurable Outcome:	All ESSA subgroup performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mike Amabile (michaella@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learner students at Estero High 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	Mike Amabile (michaella@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our areas of focus will be:
1. Math, Lowest 25th Percentile
2. ELA, Lowest 25th Percentile
3. ELA Learning Gains
4. Math Achievement
5. Math Learning Gains
The leadership team will continue to utilize model classrooms for the sharing of best practices in order to improve our L25 scores as well as increase overall learning gains in ELA and Math.
We will continue to target our ELL and SWD students for remediation including after-school tutoring, as well as teach learning strategies with our ESOL paraprofessionals and ESE teachers in their classroom environments.

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.