

Collier County Public Schools

North Naples Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

North Naples Middle School

16165 LEARNING LN, Naples, FL 34110

<https://www.collierschools.com/nnm>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Coleman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	50%
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: A (77%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (80%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

North Naples Middle School

16165 LEARNING LN, Naples, FL 34110

<https://www.collierschools.com/nnm>

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	36%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

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.

To provide a healthy, safe, and academically rigorous learning environment in order to create responsible citizens and leaders who will make a positive impact on our community now and in the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

North Naples Middle School strives to be a full learning community that involves teachers, staff, parents, and students to create a uniquely powerful learning environment.

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
Coleman, Missy	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.
Weber, Ben	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.
Berning, 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.
Mason, Jean	Instructional Coach	<p>* Works collaboratively with district and school-based leadership teams, including academic coaches, to monitor fidelity and support capacity development and sustainability of MTSS implementation.</p> <p>* Provides intensive instructional interventions (Tier 3) to support student achievement (academic and behavioral).</p>
Pinkerton, Bonnie	School Counselor	* Provides consultation to teachers in the development of the Student Success Plans (SSP) and Individual Education Plans (IEP), according to individual student needs.
Manning, Kim	School Counselor	* Provides consultation to teachers in the development of the Student Success Plans (SSP) and Individual Education Plans (IEP), according to individual student needs.
Mueller, Keri	Teacher, ESE	* Maintains a working knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) as well as guidelines pertaining to eligibility, delivery of services, individualized plan development, and MTSS.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/16/2021, Melissa Coleman

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.*

11

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

911

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

4

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

11

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	291	285	335	0	0	0	0	911
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	33	35	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	21	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	5	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	13	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	34	30	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	33	17	0	0	0	0	71
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	13	22	21	0	0	0	0	56

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

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	271	320	295	0	0	0	0	886
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	7	5	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	19	16	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	10	0	0	0	0	38

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	2	6	13	0	0	0	0	21

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	

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	271	320	295	0	0	0	0	886	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	14	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	7	5	0	0	0	0	102	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	19	16	0	0	0	0	55	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	10	0	0	0	0	38	

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	2	6	13	0	0	0	0	21

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 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				80%	59%	54%	78%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				69%	55%	54%	68%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	45%	47%	55%	50%	47%
Math Achievement				86%	69%	58%	87%	71%	58%
Math Learning Gains				79%	62%	57%	78%	67%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	57%	51%	70%	62%	51%
Science Achievement				76%	55%	51%	82%	60%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				91%	75%	72%	85%	74%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	79%	56%	23%	54%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	80%	55%	25%	52%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2021					
	2019	79%	58%	21%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	86%	61%	25%	55%	31%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	87%	66%	21%	54%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
08	2021					
	2019	52%	36%	16%	46%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	74%	52%	22%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	72%	20%	71%	21%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	67%	26%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

CCPS District created quarterly benchmark assessments

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(170/246) 69%	(184/254) 72%	(151/248) 61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(41/73) 56%	(45/77) 58%	(37/77) 48%
	Students With Disabilities	(11/34) 32%	(14/37) 38%	(7/32) 22%
	English Language Learners	(7/19) 37%	(6/18) 33%	(6/19) 32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(145/246) 59%	(164/253) 65%	(94/174) 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(33/75) 44%	(35/76) 46%	(21/52) 40%
	Students With Disabilities	(10/34) 29%	(14/37) 38%	(4/16) 25%
	English Language Learners	(6/18) 33%	(5/18) 28%	(2/8) 25%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(193/289) 67%	(223/309) 72%	(231/313) 74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(50/99) 51%	(59/107) 55%	(59/100) 59%
	Students With Disabilities	(5/30) 17%	(8/32) 25%	(14/33) 42%
	English Language Learners	(5/18) 28%	(5/20) 25%	(5/19) 26%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(217/288) 75%	(248/305) 81%	(197/283) 70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(55/95) 58%	(69/106) 65%	(46/94) 49%
	Students With Disabilities	(7/29) 24%	(17/32) 53%	(7/28) 25%
	English Language Learners	(6/18) 33%	(8/18) 44%	(6/18) 33%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(246/294) 84%	(268/311) 86%	(261/309) 84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(69/97) 71%	(77/107) 72%	(76/99) 77%
	Students With Disabilities	(16/30) 53%	(20/33) 61%	(18/33) 55%
	English Language Learners	(7/18) 39%	(9/20) 45%	(10/18) 56%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(190/280) 68%	(217/288) 75%	(178/282) 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(49/81) 60%	(50/83) 60%	(42/81) 52%
	Students With Disabilities	(6/27) 22%	(8/28) 29%	(6/25) 24%
	English Language Learners	(6/12) 50%	(6/13) 46%	(5/14) 36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(5/39) 13%	(6/38) 16%	(9/38) 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(2/23) 9%	(3/21) 14%	(5/22) 23%
	Students With Disabilities	(0/16) 0%	(0/16) 0%	(3/15) 20%
	English Language Learners	(2/5) 40%	(2/5) 40%	(1/6) 17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	(170/284) 60%	(177/286) 62%	(170/284) 60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(35/82) 43%	(40/82) 49%	(33/80) 41%
	Students With Disabilities	(6/28) 21%	(8/28) 29%	(8/25) 32%
	English Language Learners	(5/12) 42%	(4/12) 33%	(4/13) 31%

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	36	42	36	54	47	51	34	60	73		
ELL	47	61	54	61	55	51	32	63	85		
ASN	76	75		88	77						
BLK	48	52	35	64	67	71	40	57			
HSP	61	61	54	65	56	54	48	73	82		
MUL	90	78		90	73						
WHT	78	66	47	85	71	60	77	91	93		
FRL	60	60	53	65	58	55	47	70	81		
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	41	50	38	58	57	49	45	73	89		
ELL	48	69	62	71	73	71	27	75			

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
ASN	87	79		87	93						
BLK	56	41	21	41	50	50	45				
HSP	70	69	56	79	74	63	72	86	91		
MUL	88	76		94	88						
WHT	85	71	60	91	81	71	79	93	91		
FRL	65	66	54	75	71	64	66	85	85		
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	47	57	44	61	56	57	54	52	86		
ELL	35	47	41	56	68	62		46			
ASN	88	69		100	94						
BLK	61	53	33	70	65	78	75	64	85		
HSP	70	66	58	81	74	65	70	75	87		
MUL	82	73		82	73				80		
WHT	82	70	59	91	80	71	87	90	79		
FRL	66	60	53	81	74	72	77	74	92		

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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	702
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	79
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	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	83
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	74
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	61
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?

Student achievement and learning gains decreased across nearly all tested areas and student subgroups.

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

Students making gains in math is the data component showing the greatest need for improvement.

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

Staffing changes/shortages, pandemic related gaps in student background knowledge, and scheduling limitations all were contributing factors. Teacher support, development, and coaching are needed. In addition, students need to be scheduled into intensive math classes for appropriate remediation.

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

8th grade math achievement was the data component which showed the most improvement.

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

A different teacher taught the students classified in this component compared to SY19. This new teacher benefitted from an training program which included video coaching and modeled lessons.

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

All North Naples Middle School teachers will work on implementing the Marzano strategy "using questioning to help students elaborate on content." The desired effect of the strategy is to have students successfully elaborate on content.

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.

Teachers will receive content specific professional development on using questions to help students elaborate on content at the beginning of the year. Throughout the year, teachers will receive feedback and ongoing professional development on their implementation of the strategy in their lessons.

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

Teachers will receive feedback and ongoing professional development on their implementation of the strategy in their lessons. PLCs will meet weekly to plan to close the achievement gap using data. Instructional coaches will work with teachers in providing coaching cycles and professional development. Instructional coaches will work with students providing tier 3 interventions as necessary.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The need to improve learning gains for all students in ELA and math necessitated the improved efficacy of professional learning community (PLC) meetings. Through the PLC process, teachers can collaboratively plan standards-based lessons, align resources to standards, review data, planning for targeted instruction to close the achievement gap.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency in Language Arts, Math, Civics, and Physical Science will increase 3% by the end of the 2021-22 school year as a result of teachers meeting in professional learning communities to review data and plan for appropriate instruction.
Monitoring:	School administrators will regularly attend PLC meetings to guide discussions and ensure protected time is used to review data and plan for appropriate instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Missy Coleman (colemame@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use time in professional learning communities to work collaboratively on the three planning strategies within the Marzano instructional model. These strategies are Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units, Aligning Resources to Standards, and Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Using Data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Planning standards-based lessons, aligning resources to standards, and planning to close the achievement gap using data are evidenced-based strategies for increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development on the purpose of Professional Learning Communities to all faculty.

Person Responsible Ben Weber (weberb1@collierschools.com)

Create a calendar to facilitate regular, protected time for professional learning communities to meet.

Person Responsible Missy Coleman (colemame@collierschools.com)

School administrators will monitor to ensure professional learning communities are meeting frequently, and will attend regularly to facilitate.

Person Responsible Ben Weber (weberb1@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the instructional practice of using questions to help students elaborate on content. Teacher use of a sequence of increasingly complex questions will require students to critically think about the content. Developing critical thinking will enable students to elaborate on the content and display thinking beyond recall.

Measurable Outcome: Learning gains in Math will increase 5% by the end of the 2020-21 school year as a result of teachers planning a sequence of increasingly complex questions for every lesson.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through PLC meetings with an administrator, by lesson plan reviews conducted by the math coach and administrators, and through FTEM observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ben Weber (weberb1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use a sequence of increasingly complex questions that require students to critically think about the content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy is part of the common instructional language (Marzano). iObservation will be used as a structured resource to both provide support and evaluate progress on use of the strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish the evidence-based strategy as the school-wide deliberate practice element for the 2021 school year and monitor that teachers have completed the deliberate practice plan.

Person Responsible Missy Coleman (colemame@collierschools.com)

Provide math-specific professional development on how to use questioning to help students elaborate on content.

Person Responsible Ben Weber (weberb1@collierschools.com)

Provide feedback on teacher use of the instructional support strategy and monitor progress towards deliberate practice goals.

Person Responsible Ben Weber (weberb1@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is the instructional practice of using questions to help students elaborate on content. Teacher use of a sequence of increasingly complex questions will require students to critically think about the content. Developing critical thinking will enable students to elaborate on the content and display thinking beyond recall.

Measurable Outcome: Learning gains in ELA will increase 3% by the end of the 2020-21 school year as a result of teachers planning a sequence of increasingly complex questions for every lesson.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through PLC meetings with an administrator, by lesson plan reviews conducted by the math coach and administrators, and through FTEM observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ben Weber (weberb1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use a sequence of increasingly complex questions that require students to critically think about the content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy is part of the common instructional language (Marzano). iObservation will be used as a structured resource to both provide support and evaluate progress on use of the strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish the evidence-based strategy as the school-wide deliberate practice element for the 2021 school year and monitor that teachers have completed the deliberate practice plan.

Person Responsible Missy Coleman (colemame@collierschools.com)

Provide ELA-specific professional development on how to use questioning to help students elaborate on content.

Person Responsible Ben Weber (weberb1@collierschools.com)

Provide feedback on teacher use of the instructional support strategy and monitor progress towards deliberate practice goals.

Person Responsible Joe Berning (bernij1@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.

Our primary area of concern for discipline data is total suspensions. While we were well below the state average and had the second lowest number in the District (8.1/100), this was our highest incidence rate among the reported categories. We understand students need to be in school and in class in order to learn. We will foster a school environment and discipline consequences which promote students being in class whenever possible.

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.

North Naples Middle School addresses building a positive school culture and environment by celebrating the successes of individuals and groups in a variety of ways, both academically and behaviorally. This includes a PBS system that recognizes and rewards students for their academic achievement and adherence to school-wide expectations, along with the incorporation of students and staff building a sense of belonging by being members of one of our four unique houses.

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

North Naples Middle School consistently strives to build a positive school culture and environment by involving stakeholders in the decision-making processes. This includes parent, teacher, community, and student involvement through a variety of means including, but not limited to, a school PTO, School Advisory Council, and house system. All stakeholders work through these entities in fulfilling the school's mission and vision of creating an inclusive environment that provides a unique learning environment for all.