

The School District of Lee County

Mariner High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Mariner High School

701 CHIQUITA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

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

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Michel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	95%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Mariner High School

701 CHIQUITA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">67%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">49%</p>

School Grades History

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

To ensure student learning through purposeful student engagement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a world class education.

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
Michel, Tom	Principal	
White, Roberta	Assistant Principal	
Gedde, Beth	Assistant Principal	
McNeeley, Angel	Assistant Principal	
Higgins, Robert	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Thomas Michel

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

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)	95%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	413	366	353	346	1478
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	33	40	34	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	43	33	30	146
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	70	29	49	149
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	34	39	52	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	60	72	77	314
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	36	24	107	246

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	81	73	57	99	310

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	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	3	11

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	382	402	406	402	1592
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	46	27	30	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	11	4	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	61	87	41	238
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	40	19	81

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	1	34	54	31	120

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	10	18	10	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	15

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	382	402	406	402	1592
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	46	27	30	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	11	4	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	61	87	41	238
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	40	19	81

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	1	34	54	31	120

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	10	18	10	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	15

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	48%	55%	56%	52%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	49%	51%	47%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	37%	42%	42%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	35%	50%	51%	34%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	34%	45%	48%	27%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	43%	45%	27%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	56%	62%	68%	61%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	67%	73%	72%	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	50%	51%	-1%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	41%	48%	-7%	53%	-12%
	2018	46%	50%	-4%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

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	54%	56%	-2%	67%	-13%
2018	62%	61%	1%	65%	-3%
Compare		-8%			

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	67%	64%	3%	70%	-3%
2018	77%	62%	15%	68%	9%
Compare		-10%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	59%	-26%	61%	-28%
2018	26%	60%	-34%	62%	-36%
Compare		7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	50%	-16%	57%	-23%
2018	52%	53%	-1%	56%	-4%
Compare		-18%			

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	16	27	28	14	30	43	21	36		88	31
ELL	30	43	37	24	43	57	21	48		92	68
BLK	52	49	42	11	18		39	47		94	53
HSP	45	42	32	31	37	56	48	59		91	68
MUL	45	42									
WHT	50	42	38	41	34	45	61	73		95	64
FRL	41	40	34	31	34	50	47	61		93	61

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	16	30	29	16	35	25	31	55		80	29
ELL	18	41	46	25	35		36	48		82	78
BLK	45	49	35	29	39	42	61	50		84	44
HSP	45	45	43	39	41	26	57	72		95	56
MUL	56	56		25	36			69			
WHT	53	45	37	45	43	37	70	83		93	63
FRL	44	44	40	34	39	37	54	73		91	54

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	20	38	31	16	30	34	31	47		78	34

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
ELL	15	52	50	22	39	35	45	45		81	59
BLK	44	40	42	20	23		46	82		80	44
HSP	53	52	49	31	30	33	50	67		90	62
MUL	52	35		26	19		58				
WHT	54	46	38	38	25	26	71	75		92	56
FRL	48	50	41	31	28	24	53	71		88	49

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%
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	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
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	52
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	44
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	54
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	50
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.

Data from FY19: The lowest component was overall Math student proficiency: Mariner High School went down in this area from 42% to 35%. Algebra I increased from 26% to 33%, so the decrease in Math was due to Geometry proficiency levels declining. Contributing factors: teachers not using curriculum maps to keep academic pace of assessment, teachers not using instructional guides for research-based instructional practices and student engagement techniques, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) not meeting regularly to monitor student data.

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

Data from FY19: Geometry went down from 53 to 34%, showing a 19% loss from the previous school year. Contributing factors: teachers not using curriculum maps to keep academic pace of assessment, teachers not using instructional guides for research-based instructional practices and student engagement techniques, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) not meeting regularly to monitor student data.

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.

Data from FY19: Although Algebra I showed a growth from previous year to current year (from 26% to 33%, a 7% growth), the students display the farthest achievement gap when compared to the state. The state average is 61%, and our gap is 23%. Contributing factors: teachers not using curriculum maps to keep academic pace of assessment, teachers not using instructional guides for research-based instructional practices and student engagement techniques, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) not meeting regularly to monitor student data.

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

Data from FY19: Math lowest 25% learning gains showed the highest improvement, increasing from 33% to 49%, a 16% increase. In addition, Algebra I showed the most improvement in student proficiency, from 26% to 33%, a 7% growth. Our third increase was in ELA grade 9, which increased proficiency from 50% to 54%, a 4% growth. Contributing factors for these gains are: Co-facilitated support in Math classes; New teachers were brought on to teach Algebra I; Supports were given to the 9th grade ELA teachers, including district training in standards and writing; and both Algebra and ELA 9 teachers track their student progress monitoring data.

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

Addressing course grading procedures and content to ensure it aligns with state assessments, tracking student progress monitoring data from district formative assessments, and using student progress monitoring data to guide instructional practices is needed to ensure students are truly learning in their core courses and have the skills necessary to take and show proficiency on these exams. In addition, social worker, school counseling and administration teams need to monitor the EWS indicators and work together to mentor and aid at-risk students.

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

1. Support our ESE population in the core assessed areas to close the achievement gap of our ESE student population.
2. Designing a 5 year goal planning system to systematically increase all student proficiency scores in the tested areas.
3. Provide professional learning opportunities for teachers in the core assessed areas in regards to curriculum maps and instructional guides usage. Highlight and model highly effective instructional practices for teacher collaboration, reflection and increased student learning.
4. Maintain a student accountability system in regards to student daily tardies and attendance, including more calls home, parent conferences and student attendance contracts.
5. Establish and maintain higher functioning departmental PLCs by leading the PLC leader-teachers to use student data to guide instructional practices and share leadership of PLC teams to foster colleague collaboration and increased professional learning of the PLC teams.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Maintain a student accountability system in regards to daily student attendance.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of students who have a below 90% attendance rate will decrease by 10% by the end of Semester 1 and Semester 2 of the 2020-2021 school year as compared to semester 1 and 2 of the 2019-2020 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robert Higgins (robertah@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Support Systems (PBIS)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Adopting a PBIS framework changes the focus of discipline from punishment of negative behaviors to recognition of positive ones. The social-emotional connection that teachers build with students through PBIS helps to build a positive school climate. Students who see school as a positive place to be are more apt to attend regularly.
<https://www.pbisrewards.com/blog/using-pbis-improve-attendance/>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Redesign school-wide tardy to class policy
2. Calls home
3. Parent conferences
4. Student attendance contracts (denying students extra-curricular activities and events)
5. Celebrations to acknowledge students who have an attendance rate above 90%

Person Responsible Robert Higgins (robertah@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Establish and maintain higher functioning departmental Professional Learning Communities, PLCs,

Measurable Outcome: 100% of Professional Learning Community, PLC, teams will meet weekly, as measured by the meeting minutes, reviewed weekly by Administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Plan, Do, Study, Act, PDSA, process

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: An ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve.

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators.
<http://www.allthingsplc.info/about>

Action Steps to Implement

1. New leadership in PLCs for the 2019-2020 school year
2. PLCs have common planning time
3. PLCs use student progress monitoring data to guide instructional practices
4. PDSA templates shared among faculty
5. Teacher best-practices shared among PLC teams

Person Responsible: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Provide professional learning opportunities for teachers in the core assessed areas in regards to curriculum maps and instructional guides usage. Highlight and model highly effective instructional practices for teacher collaboration, reflection and increased student learning.

Measurable Outcome: 100 percent of teachers will receive professional development in the areas of curriculum maps and instructional guides by the end of quarter 1 of the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Beth Gedde (bethage@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Development with emphasis on lesson planning for standards based instruction. .

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on Charlotte Danielson's Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, lesson planning includes but is not limited to selecting content, organizing content, selecting assessments, and determining pedagogy. Teachers will review the alignment of the curriculum-based standards and high yield instructional practices related to the assessed courses.
 Danielson, C. (2007). Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching, 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: ASCD

Action Steps to Implement

1. District trained faculty to lead the 2019-2020 school year in-service
2. In-service day planned for August 7, 2019
3. Make-up sessions planned through Department Chairs
4. Administration to monitor the use of curriculum maps and instructional guides throughout school year (Via classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan checks, and short-targeted observations)

Person Responsible: Beth Gedde (bethage@leeschools.net)

#4. Other specifically relating to School Grade Goal Plan

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: To meet School Accountability and School Grade practices, Mariner High School will design a five year goal-setting plan to systematically increase all student proficiency scores in the tested areas.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency levels (levels 3-5) on the state assessments (Algebra I, Geometry, ELA grade 9, ELA grade 10, Biology and US History) will increase by at least 4% as reported on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), Spring 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angel McNeeley (angelm@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Goal-setting: Developing five-year goals for each tested subject area.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The focus of this strategy is based on the Principal's framework that encompasses instructional leadership as a two-part plan: leadership functions and leadership processes. The leadership functions described include: (1) framing and communicating school goals; (2) supervising and evaluating instruction; (3) coordinating curriculum; (4) developing high academic standards and expectations; (5) monitoring student progress; (6) promoting the professional development of teachers; (7) protecting instructional time; and (8) developing incentives for students and teachers.
 Hallinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1986). Instructional leadership in effective schools. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Frame and communicating school goals during in-service week
2. Progress monitor students using STAR and formative assessments
3. Create a data/SIP committee to review data and provide feedback and input

Person Responsible Angel McNeeley (angelm@leeschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To meet Federal Index requirements, Mariner High School will support the ESE population in the core assessed areas to close the achievement gap of the ESE student population.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of ESE students in the 9th and 10th grade scoring at proficiency (levels 3-5) in ELA as reported on the STAR assessment will increase five percentage points from the baseline score, by the quarter three progress monitoring testing window.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angel McNeeley (angelm@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using Marzano's High Yield Strategies in the classroom.
Marzano's Strategies Include:

1. Identifying similarities and differences
2. Summarizing and Note-taking
3. Homework and practice
4. Reinforcing effort and providing recognition
5. Non-linguistic representation
6. Cooperative learning
7. Setting Objectives and providing feedback
8. Generating and testing hypothesis
9. Questions, cues and advanced organizers

The use of high yield instructional strategies will authentically engage students in the meta-cognitive process to enhance student performance.
The use of the strategy is evidenced by teacher lesson plans and instructional strategies and practices used in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: High performing school systems understand that the use of research-based high yield instructional strategies improves instruction, learning and achievement.
High performing school systems understand that the quality of instruction is a more powerful achievement variable than students' background characteristics.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D. and Pollock, J. (2001). Classroom Instruction that Works – Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will support, review and monitor teacher instructional practices for Marzano High Yield Instructional Strategies being used in the classroom.
2. Use STAR progress monitoring assessment
3. Common Planning for Reading and ELA teams
4. Using PLC meeting time to discuss and learn Marzano High Yield Instructional Strategies
5. Celebrating Marzano Strategies used in classrooms by having a SOMA strategy highlighted each month: "Sharing Our Marzano in Action"

Person Responsible: Angel McNeeley (angelm@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Addressing course content to ensure it aligns with state assessments, tracking student progress monitoring data from district formative assessments, and using student progress monitoring data to guide instructional practices will be completed by both the administration and teachers in the Professional Learning Communities to ensure students are learning in their core courses and have the skills necessary to take and show proficiency on the end of course exams. In addition, social worker, school counseling and student affairs administration teams will monitor the EWS indicators and work together to mentor and aid at-risk students.

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: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Grade Goal Plan	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00