

Collier County Public Schools

Naples High School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Naples High School

1100 GOLDEN EAGLE CIR, Naples, FL 34102

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kristina Lee

Start Date for this Principal: 8/7/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Collier 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Naples High School

1100 GOLDEN EAGLE CIR, Naples, FL 34102

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	59%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Naples High School is to provide a safe and healthy learning environment in which all students have the opportunity to achieve to their highest potential and become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Naples High School's vision supports the District's mission stated simply: all students will complete school prepared for ongoing learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Manento, Joe	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing the leadership and support for the SIP process, regularly attends meetings to support the process, as well as identifies the needs of the team and communicates with school stakeholders about the SIP.
Maya, Eric	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing the leadership and support for the SIP process, regularly attends meetings to support the process, as well as identifies the needs of the team and communicates with school stakeholders about the SIP.
Keegan, Ellen	Principal	The role of the principal is to provide the leadership and facilitate the SIP structures. The principal ensures that professional development is available to staff in these areas, regularly attends meetings to support these processes, as well as identifies the needs of the team, communicates with school stakeholders, regarding the SIP and addresses each core concern. The principal serves as the instructional leader and makes informed decisions, with the leadership team, that will ultimately improve student achievement.
Quintero, Cari	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing the leadership and support for the SIP process, regularly attends meetings to support the process, as well as identifies the needs of the team and communicates with school stakeholders about the SIP.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/7/2021, Kristina Lee

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.*

0

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

86

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,736

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

18

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	444	444	433	416	1737	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	68	86	65	293	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	39	43	22	191	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	66	124	84	352	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	63	97	47	280	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	61	79	54	244	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	43	46	40	170	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	100	92	115	62	369	

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	3	2	1	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	422	453	413	476	1764
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26	39	51	142
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	47	30	34	184
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	55	33	39	167
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	53	40	39	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	86	73	65	299
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	55	59	41	206

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	63	72	55	52	242

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

2020-21 - 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	422	453	413	476	1764
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26	39	51	142
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	47	30	34	184
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	55	33	39	167
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	53	40	39	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	86	73	65	299
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	55	59	41	206

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	63	72	55	52	242

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				61%	59%	56%	64%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	52%	51%	54%	57%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	41%	42%	37%	46%	44%
Math Achievement				56%	58%	51%	58%	63%	51%
Math Learning Gains				36%	44%	48%	44%	56%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	46%	45%	51%	50%	45%
Science Achievement				69%	72%	68%	67%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	76%	73%	78%	76%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	59%	53%	6%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

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
2021					
2019	67%	68%	-1%	67%	0%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	73%	72%	1%	70%	3%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	31%	67%	-36%	61%	-30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	59%	0%	57%	2%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool used was the District created quarterly benchmark assessments. These were administered in the fall, winter and spring to all tested, content areas.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(220/393)58%	(250/418)60%	(158/364)46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(113/230) 49%	(121/249) 49%	(70/213) 33%
	Students With Disabilities	(16/55) 29%	(11/58) 19%	(9/51) 18%
	English Language Learners	(3/23) 13%	(5/29) 17%	(1/30) 3%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(249/392) 64%	(280/409) 68%	(242/380) 64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(122/232) 53%	(143/243) 59%	(123/223) 55%
	Students With Disabilities	(12/57) 21%	(17/58) 29%	(16/56) 29%
	English Language Learners	(9/24) 38%	(13/28) 46%	(12/30) 40%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(126/130) 97%	(133/136) 98%	(128/130) 98%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(45/47) 96%	(47/48) 98%	(44/45) 98%
	Students With Disabilities	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	English Language Learners	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	Economically Disadvantaged	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	Students With Disabilities	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	English Language Learners	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(185/386) 48%	(220/427) 52%	(170/392) 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(72/214) 34%	(85/236) 36%	(57/210) 27%
	Students With Disabilities	(10/44) 23%	(11/56) 20%	(3/44) 7%
	English Language Learners	(5/37) 14%	(7/41) 17%	(3/41) 7%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(44/76) 58%	(50/91) 55%	(28/87) 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(28/52) 54%	(29/62) 47%	(17/61) 28%
	Students With Disabilities	(5/11) 45%	(6/17) 35%	(3/17) 18%
	English Language Learners	(7/17) 41%	(9/19) 47%	(8/22) 36%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(149/242) 62%	(165/270) 61%	(151/225) 67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(105/178) 59%	(108/193) 56%	(102/162) 63%
	Students With Disabilities	(22/42) 52%	(25/48) 52%	(24/38) 63%
	English Language Learners	(8/35) 23%	(14/40) 35%	(14/36) 39%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(1/2) 50%	(2/3) 67%	(2/2) 100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	No Scores	(1/1) 100%	No Scores
	Students With Disabilities	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	English Language Learners	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	Economically Disadvantaged	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	Students With Disabilities	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	English Language Learners	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(44/65) 68%	(44/67) 66%	(20/57) 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(37/55) 67%	(37/57) 65%	(17/51) 33%
	Students With Disabilities	(15/24) 63%	(14/25) 56%	(5/21) 24%
	English Language Learners	(13/18) 72%	(11/16) 69%	(7/17) 41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	(0/3) 0%	(2/4) 50%	(3/4) 75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(0/2) 0%	(2/3) 67%	(2/3) 67%
	Students With Disabilities	(0/1) 0%	(2/2) 100%	(2/2) 100%
	English Language Learners	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	(210/304) 69%	(226/298) 76%	(186/272) 68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(104/181) 57%	(125/180) 69%	(97/159) 61%
	Students With Disabilities	(19/51) 37%	(23/47) 49%	(17/39) 44%
	English Language Learners	(11/30) 37%	(9/25) 36%	(7/27) 26%

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	Economically Disadvantaged	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	Students With Disabilities	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	English Language Learners	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(2/4) 50%	(3/4) 75%	(2/4) 50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(0/2) 0%	(1/2) 50%	(0/2) 0%
	Students With Disabilities	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%
	English Language Learners	(1/3) 33%	(2/3) 67%	(1/3) 33%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%
	Students With Disabilities	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%
	English Language Learners	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%	(0/1) 0%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(1/1) 100%	(1/1) 100%	(1/1) 100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	No Scores	No Scores	(1/1) 100%
	Students With Disabilities	No Scores	No Scores	No Scores
	English Language Learners	(1/1) 100%	(1/1) 100%	(1/1) 100%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	25	38	34	24	28	24	36	38		89	22
ELL	15	36	34	23	39	37	24	23		80	24
ASN	87	64					90				
BLK	30	36	32	20	20	29	45	51		91	34
HSP	40	42	39	42	33	37	48	48		87	46

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	57	42		53	38						
WHT	71	53	42	60	28	15	86	78		97	76
FRL	41	41	38	38	28	33	52	54		88	46
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	19	38	33	35	39	56	29	46		90	27
ELL	19	39	38	35	31	41	33	17		76	62
ASN	100	80									
BLK	41	35	15	39	34	50	48	49		97	63
HSP	50	51	44	48	36	44	59	59		93	61
MUL	55	61	45	68	53		64				
WHT	74	61	49	68	35	48	81	88		97	80
FRL	47	46	39	48	35	50	58	63		93	63
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	31	37	28	23	18	21	36	57		74	25
ELL	15	32	18	54	53	69	24	25		73	25
ASN	85	58								91	90
BLK	41	52	39	37	21	18	47	65		88	18
HSP	49	45	36	49	38	53	57	64		89	46
MUL	50	43		65	53		70				
WHT	78	62	37	69	52	58	78	86		96	65
FRL	49	48	35	47	35	47	53	69		89	42

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

We saw a decrease in all tested areas from 2019 to 2021. Our biggest decline was in Math and the smallest decline was in Science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The area of greatest need for improvement is in Math. Students overall did not make adequate gains and specifically the students in the lowest 25% making gains, dropped significantly.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Inconsistencies within the school year, and lack of differentiation contributed to the number of students not making significant gains. Teachers will identify the lowest 25% in each class and provide differentiation strategies and techniques to meet their individual needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our ELL subgroup showed the most improvement in Math gains, from 2019 to 2021. This group increased gains by 11% and the lowest 25% ELL students increased by 13 percentage points.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Students were grouped according to level and were providing with small group instruction, when possible.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Naples HS needs to implement differentiation strategies in every classroom, to accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities in data analysis and differentiation strategies will be delivered to support teachers and students. Teachers will group students according to level and work with both coaches and support personnel to provide individualized instruction, based on student needs.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Weekly PLC meetings will occur to dig into data and share best practices for accelerating learning. Administration will monitor the effects of the interventions and strategies and provide additional support and PD, when needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students showing proficiency in Math decreased significantly. Inconsistencies within the school year, and lack of differentiation contributed to the number of students not making significant learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, students in all subgroups will increase learning gains on the Algebra/Geometry EOC, by 5 percent. The goal is for the percent of students making gains to increase from 31 to 36.
Monitoring:	Bi-weekly meetings with Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers will occur to review lesson plans, teaching strategies, data and student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Keegan (keeganel@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize Aleks and deliver small group instruction to accelerate learning and provide remediation, when needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students need to have individualized remediation and targeted instruction. Aleks provides this opportunity and can be monitored for effectiveness.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development was provided to all teachers on how to look up relevant data on individual students and how to track progress, throughout the year.

Person Responsible Ellen Keegan (keeganel@collierschools.com)

Weekly common planning meetings with Math Coach and Principal will occur to discuss curriculum, data and remediation needs.

Person Responsible Ellen Keegan (keeganel@collierschools.com)

Individual trainings are delivered, based on teacher needs and input.

Person Responsible Ellen Keegan (keeganel@collierschools.com)

Aleks will be used with fidelity with students. Teachers will use the data to provide small group instruction.

Person Responsible Ellen Keegan (keeganel@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The percentage of students showing proficiency in ELA decreased significantly. Inconsistencies within the school year, and lack of differentiation contributed to the number of students not meeting proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, students in all subgroups will increase learning gains on the FSA ELA, by 5 percent. The goal is for the percent of students making gains to increase from 46 to 51.

Monitoring: Bi-weekly meetings with Literacy Specialist and Assistant Principal will occur to review lesson plans, teaching strategies, and student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joe Manento (manentjo@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: FSA Style close reading questions. Read180, System 44,

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the proficiency levels of the current students, our focus is on FSA ELA standard-based questioning to help increase our learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Student scheduled and appropriately placed according to their proficiency levels: After test scores were released in late July, students were rescheduled into the appropriate course sections

Person Responsible Joe Manento (manentjo@collierschools.com)

Weekly common planning meetings: Grade 9 and Grade 10 ELA teachers were able to secure common planning periods, which leads to PLC meetings with the Literacy Specialist and APC.

Person Responsible Joe Manento (manentjo@collierschools.com)

Professional Development Opportunities - During the early release day, teachers had the opportunity to learn/refresh their ability to search for, and interpret data using Data Warehouse. On the professional learning day, the Literacy Specialist took the teachers into more intense data review practices. As we continue into the school year, PD days will have a component for data review.

Person Responsible Jodi Virzi (virzij@collierschools.com)

Individual Trainings based on teacher need. Naples High School offers individualized teacher trainings once each month based on teacher input and need. These trainings are primarily done by teacher leaders or teachers with a specific skill or strategy that would like to share.

Person Responsible Joe Manento (manentjo@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students showing proficiency in US History decreased significantly. Inconsistencies within the school year, and lack of differentiation contributed to the number of students not meeting proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, students in all subgroups will show an increase in proficiency on the US History EOC, by 5 percent. The goal is for the percent of students proficient to increase from 64 to 69.
Monitoring:	Bi-weekly PLC meetings will take place with administration support to review lesson plans, teaching strategies, data and student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cari Quintero (quintc1@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use common formative assessments and quarterly benchmark assessments to identify low benchmarks. Teachers will utilize the district resources, specifically the Gateway books to provide acceleration and remediation on standards not being met by students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need to focus on addressing the state US History standards. Ongoing progress monitoring should lead to increased achievement on the US History EOC.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers were provided with professional development on how to find relevant data on each student and how to track progress, throughout the year.

Person Responsible Cari Quintero (quintc1@collierschools.com)

Teachers will meet with administrators to discuss data and curriculum on a bi-weekly basis.

Person Responsible Cari Quintero (quintc1@collierschools.com)

Professional development will be provided to teachers based on instructional needs, throughout the year.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students showing proficiency in Biology decreased significantly. Inconsistencies within the school year, and lack of differentiation contributed to the number of students not meeting proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, students in all subgroups will show an increase in proficiency, on the Biology EOC, by 5 percent. The goal is for the percent of students proficient to increase from 65 to 70.
Monitoring:	PLC meetings with Biology teachers and administration will occur to review lesson plans, teaching strategies, data and student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eric Maya (mayae@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Biology teachers will focus on the content standards, identified in the curriculum guides and use data to monitor student progress towards learning the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers should know and understand the content standards and how to analyze the effectiveness of instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers were provided with professional development on how to find relevant data on each student and how to track progress, throughout the year.

Person Responsible Eric Maya (mayae@collierschools.com)

Teachers will meet with administrators to discuss data and curriculum on a bi-weekly basis.

Person Responsible Eric Maya (mayae@collierschools.com)

Professional development will provided to teachers based on instructional needs, throughout the year.

Person Responsible Eric Maya (mayae@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

NA

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.

Administration and Teachers have been continuously seeking out ways to establish connections with the NHS student population. One of the main goals that NHS strives to build upon is respect for one another. NHS already has a strong bond amongst the staff. By showing respect to one another at this level, students can share in the community bond by exhibiting a respectfulness to their peers. The school also actively participates in the Connect for Success district initiative. Teachers and staff will continue to follow the district's campaign to build strong positive relationships with all stakeholders.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administration: Connect for Success, school wide positive influence.
 Promote positive culture through student/faculty interaction
 Faculty: Connect for Success, Classroom
 Staff: Committed to Connect for Success classrooms
 Parents: Curriculum night, volunteers,
 Community members: SAC meetings

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00