Ida S. Baker High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ida S. Baker High School

3500 AGUALINDA BLVD, Cape Coral, FL 33914

http://ibh.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jami Covert

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2014

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)	88%
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 (57%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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

Ida S. Baker High School

3500 AGUALINDA BLVD, Cape Coral, FL 33914

http://ibh.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	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

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 Ida S. Baker High School community will provide students with a challenging comprehensive education using real life applications that will prepare them to be active participants in an ever increasing technological world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ida S. Baker envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural school community where students come to learn and become active members in the community.

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
Covert, Jami	Principal	School Leader
Iandoli, James	Assistant Principal	
Massey, Tamika	Assistant Principal	
Hanrahan, Patrick	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Silva, Sandra	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Donnelly, Walter	Instructional Coach	
Jones, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Schluessler, Cathy	Teacher, K-12	
Van Horn, Rene	Teacher, K-12	
Cotrell, Kaitlyn	Teacher, K-12	
Bowden, Dayna	Teacher, K-12	
West, Allison	Teacher, K-12	
Koppen, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	
d'Albenas, Kimberly	School Counselor	
Mars, Kevin	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head and math teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/1/2014, Jami Covert

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.*
2

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
79

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)	88%
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 (57%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	448	454	403	403	1708
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	29	22	44	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	30	35	31	135
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	41	39	61	147
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	45	79	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	63	68	81	306
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	44	79	85	281

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	75	66	74	110	325

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	2	3	1	3	9

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	427	447	433	448	1755
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	66	83	104	305
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	33	30	12	96
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	427	447	433	448	1755
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	66	83	104	305
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	33	30	12	96
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	51%	55%	56%	52%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	49%	51%	45%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	37%	42%	34%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	51%	50%	51%	57%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	42%	45%	48%	50%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	43%	45%	43%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	61%	62%	68%	67%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	67%	73%	64%	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	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	47%	48%	-1%	53%	-6%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

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	60%	56%	4%	67%	-7%
2018	48%	61%	-13%	65%	-17%
Compare		12%			

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	74%	64%	10%	70%	4%
2018	63%	62%	1%	68%	-5%
Compare		11%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	59%	-16%	61%	-18%
2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Compare		-12%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	50%	8%	57%	1%
2018	53%	53%	0%	56%	-3%
Compare		5%			

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	18	31	24	32	33	50	24	45		87	22
ELL	21	40	39	40	42	40	29	39		83	50
ASN	50	50									
BLK	53	41		46	33		78	63		91	52

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
HSP	49	48	35	51	46	50	56	67		93	58
MUL	53	54		48	33		67			92	73
WHT	52	44	36	52	41	48	64	78		96	61
FRL	48	44	30	51	42	46	54	68		94	53

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	19	31	28	27	33	29	27	32		85	26
ELL	15	36	32	21	26	29	26	45		90	50
ASN	75	69		55	27						
BLK	44	45	43	33	30	36	32	50		96	45
HSP	47	42	34	53	42	36	46	65		95	56
MUL	57	50		47	31					92	64
WHT	60	52	40	58	45	45	54	64		94	61
FRL	51	46	35	46	36	31	45	64		93	55

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	14	21	17	16	34	35	28	36		71	26
ELL	12	38	43	59	55	55		58		64	
ASN	64	53		92	53						
BLK	31	43	40	42	49	45	56	43		88	21
HSP	52	49	38	59	51	45	66	56		92	61
MUL	57	57		79	62						
WHT	54	43	29	56	50	42	67	68		95	56
FRL	47	43	38	51	45	38	61	59		92	51

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	56
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	613
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	43
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	50
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	57
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Algebra EOC. Dropping proficiency from a 55% in FY18 to a 43% in FY19. The contributing factor was that lower level students were scheduled into Algebra, which didn't happen in 2017-2018.

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

Algebra proficiency from a 55% to a 43%. The factors that contributed to this decline were that not all students were scheduled in double block classes and lower level students were scheduled in the course.

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.

The state average for Algebra was 61% while Ida Baker's average was 43% which left a gap of 18%. The factor contributing to this was a district/school change of math progression.

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

The data component that showed most improvement was Biology proficiency which increased from 48% to 60%. The actions taken were aligning Environmental Science standards with Biology standards and using common mini-assessments for reteaching.

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

Attendance
Behavior

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

1. Algebra
2. 10th grade ELA
3. 9th Grade ELA
4. Learning Gains L25
5. Learning Gains ELA for 10th grade

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	16% of our student body was considered chronically absent during the 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the percentage of chronically absent students (below 90% daily attendance) from 16% to 13% or less of the total student population as tracked with FOCUS attendance by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tamika Massey (tamikarm@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Student attendance is tracked in FOCUS and in CASTLE. Parents are notified of students absences. Counselors and the Social Worker get involved when a student has 9 or more absences and the student is put on an attendance contract and an attendance letter is sent home informing the parent.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is to keep open communication with the student and parent about excessive absences. The premise of holding the student accountable for their attendance by keeping them from school events and possible withholding of credit and loss of driver's license results in improved attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Attendance taken in FOCUS and tracked in CASTLE
2. Parentlink absence call
3. Social Worker involvement
4. Attendance Contract and parent notification
5. Withholding school events, loss of credit and driver's license.

Person Responsible	Tamika Massey (tamikarm@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2018-2019 and the 2019-2020 Ida. S. Baker focused on reducing the number of referrals and building positive relationship. We plan to continue this reduction during the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the percentage of the total student population receiving behavioral referrals to 10% or less as measured by the District Support Application Systems by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Iandoli (jamesmi@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers building positive relationships with students, security in the hallways and supervising cameras, classroom engagement, rigor of instruction, AVID & Kagan structures, Teacher/parent phone calls, student mentoring, PD for ESE resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for using this strategy is that if teachers build positive relationships with students, they will become involved in school and take ownership of their learning. This will result in positive behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students meet with a homeroom teacher twice monthly
2. Participation in activities to increase student participation in school events and develop positive emotional social behaviors.
3. Mentoring students about grades and attendance
4. Reduction of referrals through fostering positive behaviors.

Person Responsible	James Iandoli (jamesmi@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 18-19 school year: 51% increased proficiency in the FSA ELA. This is a decrease from the year before of 4%,
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency for FSA ELA from 51% to 54% as measured by the FY21 FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schoolwide use of a variety of strategies in all content areas to increase reading comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students reading proficiency will increase as they practice proven strategies for increased reading comprehension in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Test taking skills
2. Content and Standard Knowledge
3. Differentiated Instruction
4. Rigor of Questioning
5. Cross curricular collaboration
6. Schoolwide reading initiative
7. CEA
8. Reading & Writing in the content area
9. AVID WICOR methodology
10. KAGAN strategies
11. Progress monitoring

Person Responsible   Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 18-19 school year there was a decrease in math proficiency from 54% to 51%. This is a decrease of 3%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency for math achievement from 51% to 54% as measured by the FY21 Algebra and Geometry EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Follow the Academic Plans and Standards and use Algebra Nation to increase proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data Chats and Formatives during Algebra and Geometry Professional Learning Communities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaboration
2. Test taking skills
3. Spiraling content
4. Stable Math Department
5. Algebra Nation
6. Differentiated instruction
7.Utilizing Intensive Math to fill their math deficiency
8. AVID & KAGAN
9. USA Test Prep
10. Progress monitoring

Person Responsible	Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)

1. Collaboration
2. Test taking skills
3. Spiraling content
4. Stable Math Department
5. Algebra Nation
6. Differentiated instruction
7.Utilizing Intensive Math to fill their math deficiency
8. AVID & KAGAN
9. USA Test Prep
10. Progress monitoring

Person Responsible	Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities will be the area of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY19.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD subgroup performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jami Covert (jamidc@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 at Ida S. Baker 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	Jami Covert (jamidc@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Students will participate in a monthly "homeroom" period called Bulldogs Connect. This will be a relation building time to discuss grades, attendance, and do activities to support student's social emotional growth. The purpose for this is to improve attendance, foster good behaviors and increase overall success in school by building a positive relationship with an adult mentor.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00