

The School District of Lee County

# Ida S. Baker High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>21</b> |

# 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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 88%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: B (56%)<br>2015-16: C (49%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>21</b> |

## Ida S. Baker High School

3500 AGUALINDA BLVD, Cape Coral, FL 33914

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | No                     | 56%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 88%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: B (56%)<br>2015-16: C (49%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |



|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Year</b>  |      |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |      |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

## 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 | 0 | 427 | 447 | 433 | 448 | 1755  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 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 | 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   | 0   |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 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 |       |
| 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 | 427 | 447 | 433 | 448 | 1755  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 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 | 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   | 0   |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | 16% of our student body was considered chronically absent during the 2019-2020 school year.  |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 |  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 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.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Tamika Massey (tamikarm@leeschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | 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.        |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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 landoli (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 landoli (jamesmi@leeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus<br/>Description and<br/>Rationale:</b>   | During the 18-19 school year: 51% increased proficiency in the FSA ELA. This is a decrease from the year before of 4%,                  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>  | Increase proficiency for FSA ELA from 51% to 54% as measured by the FY21 FSA ELA assessment.  |
| <b>Person responsible for<br/>monitoring outcome:</b>   | Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based<br/>Strategy:</b>   | Schoolwide use of a variety of strategies in all content areas to increase reading comprehension.                                       |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-<br/>based Strategy:</b>  | Students reading proficiency will increase as they practice proven strategies for increased reading comprehension in all content areas. |
| <b>Action Steps to Implement</b>  |   |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Test taking skills</li> <li>2. Content and Standard Knowledge</li> <li>3. Differentiated Instruction</li> <li>4. Rigor of Questioning</li> <li>5. Cross curricular collaboration</li> <li>6. Schoolwide reading initiative</li> <li>7. CEA</li> <li>8. Reading &amp; Writing in the content area</li> <li>9. AVID WICOR methodology</li> <li>10. KAGAN strategies</li> <li>11. Progress monitoring</li> </ol> |   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>   | Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)  |

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | During the 18-19 school year there was a decrease in math proficiency from 54% to 51%. This is a decrease of 3%. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Increase proficiency for math achievement from 51% to 54% as measured by the FY21 Algebra and Geometry EOC.      |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Follow the Academic Plans and Standards and use Algebra Nation to increase proficiency.                          |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |