The School District of Lee County

North Fort Myers High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

North Fort Myers High School

5000 ORANGE GROVE BLVD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://nfm.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Debbie Diggs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2016

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)	77%
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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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.](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

North Fort Myers High School

5000 ORANGE GROVE BLVD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://nfm.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	44%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

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

North Fort Myers High School's mission is to guide students in a purposeful and challenging direction and to inspire mastery of skills for lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

North Fort Myers High School's vision is to prepare every student for success.

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
Diggs, Debbie	Principal	
McKeever, Douglas	Assistant Principal	
Bucher, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	
Curls, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	
Conn, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Hutchinson, Samantha	Assistant Principal	
Cook, Susan	Teacher, K-12	ELA Dept Chari
Amaya, Ronda	Assistant Principal	
Agostinelli, Donna	Teacher, K-12	Math Dept Chair
Scimeca, Tracey	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach and Dept Chair
Robson, Donna	Teacher, ESE	ESE Dept Chair
Iriarte, Natasha	Teacher, K-12	Foreign Language Dept Chair
Kamphouse, Garry	Teacher, K-12	CTE Dept Chair
Johnson, Sara	Teacher, K-12	Performing Arts Dept Chair
Maldonado, Felipe	Teacher, K-12	Visual Arts Dept Chair
Erickson, Nick	Teacher, K-12	PE Dept Chair
Tutterrow, Keri	School Counselor	
Lansberry, Billy	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/27/2016, Debbie Diggs

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
82

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)	77%
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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	420	465	438	464	1787
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	21	21	26	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	17	20	75
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	35	33	103
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	40	40	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	35	35	29	139
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	50	60	169

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	28	35	52	49	164

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	1	0	0	1	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	5

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	429	516	459	434	1838
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	47	57	63	206
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	42	33	21	123
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	105	74	19	266
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	105	68	27	273

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	49	81	57	21	208

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	429	516	459	434	1838
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	47	57	63	206
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	42	33	21	123
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	105	74	19	266
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	105	68	27	273

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	49	81	57	21	208

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	76%	55%	56%	69%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	49%	51%	52%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	37%	42%	32%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	61%	50%	51%	54%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	49%	45%	48%	44%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	43%	45%	22%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	80%	62%	68%	74%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	67%	73%	67%	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	76%	51%	25%	55%	21%
	2018	73%	51%	22%	53%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	75%	48%	27%	53%	22%
	2018	75%	50%	25%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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	79%	56%	23%	67%	12%
2018	81%	61%	20%	65%	16%
Compare		-2%			

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	77%	64%	13%	70%	7%
2018	64%	62%	2%	68%	-4%
Compare		13%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	59%	-18%	61%	-20%
2018	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	50%	17%	57%	10%
2018	63%	53%	10%	56%	7%
Compare		4%			

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	28	35	27	22	42	39	35	46		98	23
ELL	48	52	27	47	56		75				
ASN	89	72		82	73					92	92
BLK	63	51	27	48	52	30	55	53		94	40
HSP	72	64	45	52	41	44	76	73		96	74
MUL	61	52	40	42	35		77			89	56
WHT	78	63	47	65	52	41	83	81		98	71
FRL	68	61	43	51	44	33	71	65		95	62
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	28	46	40	36	43	36	41	43		75	39
ELL		58			25						
ASN	89	72		54	45		82				
BLK	82	49	62	47	38		88	46		88	57
HSP	70	65	55	58	50	49	83	73		94	66
MUL	76	50		72	53		100	60			
WHT	75	63	48	59	43	30	81	64		93	68
FRL	68	59	49	50	42	34	76	58		89	58

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	25	26	24	16	26	19	25	45		79	39
ELL	23	31		29	29						
ASN	69	50		59	50		55	55			
BLK	51	50	38	44	40	22	57	57		96	46
HSP	66	53	34	49	42	21	72	63		91	62
MUL	47	38		27	26		50	62		100	55
WHT	71	52	31	57	46	23	78	69		97	78
FRL	58	45	29	46	41	17	64	63		93	61

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	64
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	706
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	50
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	83
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	51
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	62
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	57
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	68
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	59
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.

Based upon FY19 Data:
Of the 4 content areas, math performance data was the lowest at 60% overall with Algebra being at 41% and Geometry being at 67%. Pertaining to Alg 1, as an AICE school, the majority of our students enter 9th grade with Geometry. Only our lowest level freshmen are typically taking Algebra and are primarily level 1 or 2 to begin with. We have also struggled with teacher collaboration of data on the Algebra team. The trend for Algebra has been decreasing. Geometry, while also a lower data point has been on an upward trend, increasing in proficiency the last two years. This can be attributed to an increased focus on progress monitoring data, a teaming structure and strategic student scheduling.

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

Based upon FY19 Data:
The only proficiency decrease we had was Biology which went from 82% to 79%. Even with this decline we had the top rate in our district and were still 12% points above the state average. No specific factor has been identified other that completely different sets of kids were tested.

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.

Based upon FY19 Data:
Alg 1 is the only area we are below the state average (and it is a significant gap of 21% points. Pertaining to Alg 1, as an AICE school, the majority of our students enter 9th grade with Geometry. Only our lowest level freshmen are typically taking Algebra and are primarily level 1 or 2 to begin with. We have also struggled with teacher collaboration of data on the Algebra team.

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

Based upon FY19 Data:
US History showed the most improvement (increase of 15% points). We implemented processes to increase teamed conversations throughout the year on data results from progress monitoring, had teachers share and implement best practices, utilized a individual student data board and more strategically scheduled students.

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

In looking at EWS Data from last year, attendance and course failures is of most concern.

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

1. Decrease Absenteeism Rate
2. Decrease ISS Rate
3. Increase Alg 1 Proficiency
4. Increase ELA L25 Gains at the 9th grade
5. Increase the ESSE Federal Index for ESE subgroup

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A continued focus is to decrease chronic absenteeism. Increasing the time students are in school contributes to improved grades and graduation rates.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of chronically absent students by 10% from 84 to 75 students as measured by FOCUS Attendance Report by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- Weekly monitoring of attendance - Focus on early intervention with students in the 6%-9% range. - Mentoring program for students that reach 10% absenteeism.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that monitoring, early intervention, and mentoring programs are effective strategies to decrease the number of chronically absent students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor absences Weekly
2. Identify students that fall between the 6%-9% range and students 10% or higher.
3. Send a weekly email to staff that identify the students above to increase teacher awareness and assist in interventions with students.
4. Attendance AP, Social Worker, and School Counselors (in addition to the feedback from teacher in the email above) will meet with students and contact parents to identify root causes of students' absences for the students falling in the 6%-9% range.
5. Mentor will be assigned once a student meets the 10% absenteeism rate and continued to be monitored by Attendance AP, Social Worker, and/or School Counselors.

Person Responsible   Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning and performance is negatively impacted by students that miss classroom instructional time due to inappropriate behavior.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of In-School-Suspension consequences by 10% from 75 to 67 as measured by SESIR reported to District application by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Douglas McKeever (douglasim@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Instructional change in the Center for Corrective Action (ISS room). Two teachers will facilitate teaching and learning while students are in the CCA and also utilize their respective de-escalation techniques and skills to improve student inappropriate behavior. 2. Enact restorative practices as a means to alter and change student negative behavior to a positive mindset.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research clearly demonstrates that mentors, positive role models, and student recognition contribute to positive student outcomes, thus reducing inappropriate behaviors and aide in the teaching and learning process.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet weekly with CCA facilitators to monitor data of student inappropriate behavior.
2. Meet monthly with the Restorative Justice/ Student Recognition Committee to evaluate, plan and review student ISS progress.
3. Provide mentors for students with continuous behavior management concerns.

Person Responsible	Douglas McKeever (douglasim@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Algebra I EOC is 30% of student's grade and a passing grade in the course and EOC is a graduation requirement.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Algebra I proficiency from 39% to 58% as measured by the Algebra 1 FSA EOC by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Diggs (debbieldi@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of school and district based formative assessments. Instructional strategies to support ESE and ELL students are scaffolding, activating background knowledge, peer tutoring, and graphic organizers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Formative and benchmark assessments personalize learning and align student instruction with standards they struggle by using differentiated instruction. Graphic organizers make it easier to organize thought and encourage students to make decisions in their own learning. Peer tutoring allows students to increase their own understanding of material and assists in the mastery of skills through re-teaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Benchmarks and formative assessments

1. Administer baseline and quarterly benchmark assessments & analyze results.
2. Identify essential EOC standards where students are deficient, based on formative data.
3. Increase practice time on test specifics and problem structures.
4. Differentiate practice.

Instructional practices to support ESSA sub-groups

1.Use of scaffolding to activate prior knowledge and assist students in understanding prior to new skill being taught.
2.Use of graphic organizers to organize thoughts and assist in problem solving.

Person Responsible	Debbie Diggs (debbieldi@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There has been a three year trend of minimal gain increase in the 9th grade L25 gains while 10th grade L25 gains have shown continuous growth and have met school goals.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase 9th grade ELA L25 gains from 38% to 45% as measured by the ELA FSA by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The 9th grade ELA L25s will be targeted through their English 1 and Intensive Reading classes. Teachers will use targeted vocabulary instruction, high-yield strategies, small group instruction, and scaffolding.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High-yield strategies have been show to produce increases in student achievement, targeted vocabulary instruction improves comprehension, scaffolding provides support for students to enhance learning and aids in the mastery of tasks, and small group instruction provides opportunity to differentiate instruction to support individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer baseline and quarterly benchmark assessments
2. Analyze data to guide instruction
3. Incorporate evidence based strategies to target deficiencies
4. Reassess after instruction

Person Responsible   Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESE subgroup was identified a subgroup performing at 41% and below and the need for additional strategies and supports.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities identified on the Federal ESSE Index will improve performance in tested areas from 40% to 43% as measured by the FSA and FSAA by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Diggs (debbieldi@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Scaffolding tasks, skill/task modeling, and explicit vocabulary instruction through SAID strategy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that building on students' prior knowledge and experiences as they are learning new skills supports ESE students and enhances learning, scaffolding is a strategy to provide this support. Modeling provides an opportunity for student to self-regulate learning and teachers/students to share their thinking through tasks/skills. Additionally, students with learning disabilities benefit from explicit vocabulary instruction, repeated exposure to new words, and opportunities to use new word in classroom activities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Scaffolding tasks through questioning techniques to activate prior knowledge and experience.
2. Teachers and students to model reading and thinking to provide examples of
Review material for critical vocabulary (both content and non-content, ex. addition, describe).

Vocabulary-
1. SAID strategy (Synonyms, antonyms, inference information, definition.
2. Pre-teach vocab/activities
3. Incorporate words in context within lesson and language rich environment.
4. Include vocabulary in formative and summative assessments

Person Responsible	Debbie Diggs (debbieldi@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The quarterly failure rate will be tracked and discussed at our monthly teacher leadership meetings to then be further discussed and strategies implemented at the department and PLC levels.

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: Discipline	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00