# Mariner High School



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Mariner High School

## 701 CHIQUITA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

### http://mrh.leeschools.net/

**Demographics**

## Principal: Thomas Michel

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | No |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 95% |
| **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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) |
| **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 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.](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

## Mariner High School

### 701 CHIQUITA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

### http://mrh.leeschools.net/

### School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2020-21 Title I School** | **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| High School<br>9-12 | No | 66% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 51% |

### School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | | C | C | 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.**

To ensure student learning through purposeful student engagement.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To provide a world class education.

### School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Michel, Tom | Principal | |
| Gedde, Beth | Assistant Principal | |
| Higgins, Robert | Assistant Principal | |
| McNeeley, Angel | Assistant Principal | |
| White, Roberta | Assistant Principal | |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 8/16/2021, Thomas Michel

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
1,712

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

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

**Demographic Data**

### Early Warning Systems

**2021-22**

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 477 | 455 | 398 | 382 | 1712 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 87 | 88 | 87 | 359 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 46 | 32 | 22 | 129 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 113 | 72 | 85 | 278 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 52 | 57 | 172 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 129 | 94 | 100 | 407 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 200 | 148 | 127 | 573 |
| 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 179 | 134 | 145 | 551 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 13 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/16/2021

**2020-21 - As Reported**

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

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

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 73 | 57 | 99 | 310 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 |

**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 | 413 | 366 | 353 | 346 | 1478 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 33 | 40 | 34 | 147 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 43 | 33 | 30 | 146 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 70 | 29 | 49 | 149 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 34 | 39 | 52 | 128 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 60 | 72 | 77 | 314 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 36 | 24 | 107 | 246 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 73 | 57 | 99 | 310 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 |

## 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 | | | | 48% | 55% | 56% | 50% | 55% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 43% | 49% | 51% | 46% | 50% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35% | 37% | 42% | 39% | 42% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 35% | 50% | 51% | 42% | 54% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 34% | 45% | 48% | 42% | 43% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49% | 43% | 45% | 33% | 43% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 56% | 62% | 68% | 66% | 70% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 67% | 67% | 73% | 76% | 66% | 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 | 54% | 51% | 3% | 55% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 48% | -7% | 53% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |

| 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 | 54% | 56% | -2% | 67% | -13% |
| 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 | 67% | 64% | 3% | 70% | -3% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 33% | 59% | -26% | 61% | -28% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 34% | 50% | -16% | 57% | -23% |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 131/37 | 123/32.4 | 152/39.4 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/11.1 | 0/0 | 8/18.2 |
| | English Language Learners | 2/5.6 | 2/5.3 | 6/15.4 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 123/39.1 | 133/38.1 | 146/41.8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/7.7 | 4/9.3 | 5/11.1 |
| | English Language Learners | 2/6.5 | 1/2.9 | 9/30 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 129/81.1 | 146/89.6 | 146/93 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/100 | 1/50 | 3/100 |
| | English Language Learners | 3/75 | 2/50 | 2/100 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 124/43.5 | 130/40.1 | 147/43.9 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6/26.1 | 6/22.2 | 5/19.2 |
| | English Language Learners | 2/12.5 | 0/0 | 0/0 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42/24.7 | 52/26.1 | 48/24.0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/19 | 4/16.7 | 2/10 |
| | English Language Learners | 3/25 | 3/23.1 | 4/33.3 |
| **Biology** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 61/42.4 | 94/138 | 99/71.7 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7/30.4 | 12/54.5 | 10/58.8 |
| | English Language Learners | 7/43.8 | 11/64.7 | 12/75 |
| **US History** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| **Biology** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| **US History** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 124/45.8 | 151/53.7 | 144/54.8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 9/25 | 11/31.4 | 9/26.5 |
| | English Language Learners | 4/22.2 | 5/31.3 | 3/18.8 |

| Grade 12 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

## 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 | 5 | 22 | 30 | 13 | 19 | 19 | 22 | 31 | | 91 | 36 |
| ELL | 19 | 53 | 59 | 19 | 19 | 10 | 38 | 33 | | 97 | 58 |
| BLK | 36 | 32 | 30 | 18 | 8 | | | 41 | | 100 | 41 |
| HSP | 37 | 41 | 42 | 31 | 20 | 13 | 55 | 47 | | 99 | 69 |
| MUL | 33 | 43 | | 27 | 13 | | 46 | 57 | | 100 | 100 |

| 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 |
| WHT | 46 | 38 | 44 | 33 | 21 | 12 | 58 | 61 | | 96 | 68 |
| FRL | 30 | 34 | 36 | 25 | 20 | 11 | 47 | 43 | | 96 | 59 |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 16 | 27 | 28 | 14 | 30 | 43 | 21 | 36 | | 88 | 31 |
| ELL | 30 | 43 | 37 | 24 | 43 | 57 | 21 | 48 | | 92 | 68 |
| BLK | 52 | 49 | 42 | 11 | 18 | | 39 | 47 | | 94 | 53 |
| HSP | 45 | 42 | 32 | 31 | 37 | 56 | 48 | 59 | | 91 | 68 |
| MUL | 45 | 42 | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 42 | 38 | 41 | 34 | 45 | 61 | 73 | | 95 | 64 |
| FRL | 41 | 40 | 34 | 31 | 34 | 50 | 47 | 61 | | 93 | 61 |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 16 | 30 | 29 | 16 | 35 | 25 | 31 | 55 | | 80 | 29 |
| ELL | 18 | 41 | 46 | 25 | 35 | | 36 | 48 | | 82 | 78 |
| BLK | 45 | 49 | 35 | 29 | 39 | 42 | 61 | 50 | | 84 | 44 |
| HSP | 45 | 45 | 43 | 39 | 41 | 26 | 57 | 72 | | 95 | 56 |
| MUL | 56 | 56 | | 25 | 36 | | | 69 | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 45 | 37 | 45 | 43 | 37 | 70 | 83 | | 93 | 63 |
| FRL | 44 | 44 | 40 | 34 | 39 | 37 | 54 | 73 | | 91 | 54 |

## 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 | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 58 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 516 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 96% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 38 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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?**

All major content areas, with the exception of Biology, have decreased in proficiency levels from the 2018-2019 to the 2020-2021 school year. (no state testing in the 2019- 2020 school year). Graduation rate has increased from 975% to 98% and College and Career Readiness has increased from 64% to 67%. In addition, ELL students made progress and showed increases in ELA in overall gains, earning 46% from 42%; and ELL students in the lowest 25 percent in ELA made gains from 39% to 63%.

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

Students with disabilities are scoring below the federal index at 33%. Progress monitoring data shows that during the 2020-2021 grade 9 ESE students showed an increase in proficiency in all core courses, and grade 10 and above did not show increases in proficiency levels in core courses.

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

Contributing factors were the various modes of instructional delivery, most specifically online learning formats and lower than average attendance rates. Current actions to address these areas include: Professional Learning Community student progress monitoring, schoolwide data chats, attendance monitoring and social worker involvement in assisting with attendance.

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

College and Career Acceleration increased from 64% to 67%. ELA lowest 25% increased from 35% to 41%.

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

Contributing factors for improvement in College and Career Acceleration include increasing enrollment in Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, and Industry Certification courses. In addition, supports for students include AP practice exams, opportunities to participate in STEM at work, Girls

Lead Symposium, and participating in Career Advisory Boards. For ELA improvement, students participated in Back on Track and Lee Home Connect tutoring programs.

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

In Professional Learning Communities, teachers are using intervention and extension activities to promote learning. Teachers are sharing instructional strategies and best practices, providing tutoring and an ESE learning lab, ESOL paraprofessional provides push-in support, and use interactive agenda extension activities.

**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 have access to weekly Tech Tuesdays that provide ongoing technical support for al programs used in instruction. New teachers have monthly APPLES professional development to support instructional strategies and best practices in the classroom. Departments attend Leading and Learning quarterly professional development led by the District.

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

Continued professional development opportunities designed to support students with disabilities, second language learners, and ongoing progress monitoring.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | In the 2020-2021 school year, 818 students were absent more than 10 days. The percent of students who fell below 90% attendance (or missing more than 10 instructional school days) was 54%. Our attendance goal is based on using research-based indicators to identify students at risk of failing to meet key educational milestones such as reading at grade level, on-time graduation, and college readiness and college persistence. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The percent of students who have a below 90% attendance rate will decrease by 10% by the end of Semester 1 and Semester 2 of the 2021-2022 school year as compared to semester 1 and 2 of the 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Monitoring:** | 1. Redesign school-wide tardy to class policy<br>2. Calls home<br>3. Parent conferences<br>4. Student attendance contracts (denying students extra-curricular activities and events)<br>5. Celebrations to acknowledge students who have an attendance rate above 90% |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Beth Gedde (bethage@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Positive Behavior Support Systems (PBIS) |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Adopting a PBIS framework changes the focus of discipline from punishment of negative behaviors to recognition of positive ones. The social-emotional connection that teachers build with students through PBIS helps to build a positive school climate. Students who see school as a positive place to be are more apt to attend regularly. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Daily Attendance monitoring
2. Calls/Letters home
3. Parent conferences
4. Student attendance contracts (denying students extra-curricular activities and events)
5. Celebrations to acknowledge students who have an attendance rate above 90%

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Establish and maintain higher functioning departmental Professional Learning Communities, PLCs, |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 100% of Professional Learning Community, PLC, teams will meet weekly, as measured by the meeting minutes, reviewed weekly by Administration. |
| **Monitoring:** | Schoolwide curriculum aligned lesson plans, student progress monitoring spreadsheets, and PLC agenda/minutes. All items saved in team drive. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Plan - Do - Study - Act, PLC Process. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | An ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators. http://www.allthingsplc.info/about |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. New leadership in PLCs for the 2020-2021 school year
2. PLCs have common planning time (Schoolwide, Afterschool on Mondays)
3. PLCs use student progress monitoring data to guide instructional practices
4. PDSA templates (in PLC Agenda/Minutes)shared among faculty
5. Teacher best-practices shared among PLC teams (Common Lesson Planning Tool)

**Person Responsible**    [no one identified]

1. New leadership in PLCs for the 2020-2021 school year
2. PLCs have common planning time (Schoolwide, Afterschool on Mondays)
3. PLCs use student progress monitoring data to guide instructional practices
4. PDSA templates (in PLC Agenda/Minutes)shared among faculty
5. Teacher best-practices shared among PLC teams (Common Lesson Planning Tool)

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

| #3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | To meet Federal Index requirements, Mariner High School will support the ESE<br>population in the core assessed areas to close the achievement gap of the<br>ESE student population. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The percentage of ESE students in the 9th and 10th grade scoring at proficiency (levels 3-5) in ELA as reported on the STAR assessment will increase five percentage points from the baseline score, by the quarter three<br>progress monitoring testing window. |
| **Monitoring:** | Area of focus will be measured using STAR progress monitoring assessments and District created exemplars. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Angel McNeeley (angeltm@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Using Marzano's High Yield Strategies in the classroom.<br>Marzano's Strategies Include:<br>1.Identifying similarities and differences<br>2. Summarizing and Note-taking<br>3. Homework and practice<br>4. Reinforcing effort and providing recognition<br>5. Non-linguistic representation<br>6. Cooperative learning<br>7. Setting Objectives and providing feedback<br>8. Generating and testing hypothesis<br>9. Questions, cues and advanced organizers |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The use of high yield instructional strategies will authentically engage students in the meta-cognitive process to enhance student performance. The use of the strategy is evidenced by teacher lesson plans and instructional strategies and practices used in the classroom.<br>High performing school systems understand that the use of research-based<br>high yield instructional strategies improves instruction, learning and achievement.<br>High performing school systems understand that the quality of instruction is<br>a more powerful achievement variable than students' background characteristics.<br>Marzano, R., Pickering, D. and Pollock, J. (2001). Classroom Instruction that<br>Works – Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement.<br>Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will support, review and monitor teacher instructional practices for Marzano High Yield Instructional Strategies being used in the classroom. (Using Common Lesson Plans)
2. Use STAR progress monitoring assessment/District created exemplars
3. Common Planning for all PLC Teams (Mondays, 1:45 - 2:45)
4. Using PLC meeting time to discuss and learn Marzano High Yield Instructional Strategies

5. Celebrating Marzano Strategies used in classrooms by having a SOMA strategy highlighted each month: "Sharing Our Marzano in Action"

**Person Responsible**         Angel McNeeley (angeltm@leeschools.net)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

**According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, reported 11.5 incidents per 100 students, which is very high and ranks second highest in the state. The total incidents per school year was 177.**
**Areas of concern are overall referrals and SESIR referrals.**
**At Mariner High School, we are aligning our student affairs goals to The School District of Lee County, who 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.**

## 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.

Mariner High School is committed to students' cultures and builds relationships between teachers and students. Mariner High School creates an environment where students feel safe and respected before, during, and after school by providing multiple opportunities for various learners to thrive. Mariner High School has multiple clubs and activities that focus on varying interests, and Wellness Wednesdays (a mental health support curriculum) allows for stronger mutually respectful relationships to be built with various stakeholders on campus. Mariner High School has a variety of opportunities that promote an environment of safety and respect: consistent visibility of adults, process documents for supervision, a single point of entry, on site deputies, and monthly safety drills.

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

Mariner High School Stakeholders are as follows, including their role in providing an safe and secure learning environment.
Principal/Assistant Principal
• Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in the building
• Provide and coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
• Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible
• Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process
• Conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity
• Ensure the implementation PLCs
Classroom Teachers
• Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (Curriculum Assessments, STAR, Exemplars, EOC, or FSA Scores, Work Samples, Anecdotal) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing
• Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on and monitor students who are struggling
• Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports
• Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
• PLC participation
Reading Coach
• Attend MTSS Team meetings
• Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction
• Implement supplemental and intensive interventions

• Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotal of interventions implemented
• Administer screenings
• Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students
Speech-Language Pathologist
• Attend MTSS Team meetings for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports
• Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions
• Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral and when making eligibility decisions
School Counselor/Intervention Specialist
• Attend MTSS Team facilitator meetings
• Schedule and attend MTSS Team meetings
• Maintain log of all students involved in the MTSS process
• Send parent invites
• Complete necessary MTSS forms
• Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested
• Conduct Parent/Teacher conferences
• Provide Mental Health Services
School Psychologist
• Attend MTSS Team meetings on some students receiving supplemental supports and on all students receiving intensive supports
• Monitor data collection process for fidelity
• Review and interpret progress monitoring data
• Collaborate with MTSS Team on effective instruction and specific interventions
• Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible ESE referral and when making eligibility decisions
ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist
• Consult with MTSS Team regarding intensive interventions
• Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions
Specialist (Behavior, OT, PT, ASD)
• Consult with MTSS Team
• Provide staff training
Social Worker/LMHP
• Attend MTSS Team meetings when requested
• Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with MTSS Team
• Provides Mental Health Services
• Home Visits
• Provides referrals to outside mental health services and agencies
ESOL/ELL Representative
• Attend all MTSS Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
• Conduct language screenings and assessments
• Provide ELL interventions at all tiers
Parent Groups/Boosters/School Advisory Council
• Evaluation of last year's school improvement plan
• Development of this school improvement plan: is to ensure the SIP is approved, implemented, and consistently monitored to ensure continuous improvement and academic achievement.

## Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | $0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |