Bonita Springs High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bonita Springs High School

25592 IMPERIAL PKWY, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

http://bnh.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jeffrey Estes Jr

Start Date for this Principal: 2/7/2017

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)	79%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: No Grade
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.

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

Bonita Springs High School

25592 IMPERIAL PKWY, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

http://bnh.leeschools.net/

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 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	62%

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.

Embody a culture of excellence through high-quality instruction, social and academic development of students, and collaboration with families and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educate, engage, enrich, and inspire all students to be future ready.

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
Estes, Jeff	Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal - Evaluate data to help make school-based decisions. - Participate in leadership team meetings to discuss issues and concerns. - Conduct classroom walk-throughs and formal/informal evaluations to evaluate instructional practices - Provide a safe environment for teachers and students to work at a high level. - Hold faculty meetings to inform, train, and discuss faculty and staff concerns. - Support assigned PLC teams Reading Coach - Assist in promoting literacy through all content areas (cross-curricular) - Support teachers through modeling, discussion, and data analysis. School Counselors - Ensure students are scheduled into correct courses. - Meet with students to discuss graduation status and career path options. - Communicate with parents and teachers on how a student is progressing in his/her education. - Provide input on the master schedule. Department Heads - Lead weekly PLC meetings with your department. - Ensure information gathered at leadership meetings is communicated to team members. - Support department in helping them get necessary items ordered. - Work with your assigned administrator in ordering the necessary items (e.g. textbooks, materials, supplies). - Communicate information from your department to the Principal or Assitant Principals if an issue arises. Career Specialist - SCOIR Champion and training coordinator. - College planning and Application Coordinator/Coach. - Work with students on setting up their Bright Futures accounts. - Setup College/Career Signing Days. - Meet with seniors to discuss post-secondary options, resume building, and interview skills.
Aldrich, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Bredenkamp, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Drake, Christopher	Assistant Principal	

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Urrely, Monica	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Marie	Staffing Specialist	
Holloway, Autumn	Graduation Coach	
Janssen, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 2/7/2017, Jeffrey Estes Jr

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

69

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,565

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

12

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

17

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	381	407	399	378	1565
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	80	84	94	320
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	10	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	69	71	183
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	64	70	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	69	94	61	311
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	37	47	73	227
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	56	115	134	114	419

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	11

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 10/11/2021

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	389	365	393	260	1407
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	37	46	46	151
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	16	10	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	51	49	149
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	42	35	59	138
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	69	94	61	311
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	37	47	73	227

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	64	78	74	81	297

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	1	4	6	6	17

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	381	407	399	378	1565
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	80	84	94	320
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	10	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	43	69	71	195
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	32	64	70	178
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	69	94	61	311
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	37	47	73	227

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	64	78	74	81	297

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	1	4	6	6	17

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				49%	55%	56%	47%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				39%	49%	51%	45%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				20%	37%	42%	44%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				55%	50%	51%	80%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				39%	45%	48%	42%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	43%	45%	56%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				68%	62%	68%	91%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement					67%	73%		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	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	63%	56%	7%	67%	-4%

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					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	38%	59%	-21%	61%	-23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	67%	50%	17%	57%	10%

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 (exemplar assessments).

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Biology	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	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	19/11.9	14/7.6	23/12.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.2	2/7.1	2/6.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/1.7	3/5.1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	155/53.3	13131/45	134/46.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/50	2/50	2/50
	English Language Learners	3/18.8	3/18.8	4/22.2
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	161/80.9	163/85.8	164/83.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/66.7	2/66.7	2/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86/41.5	181/54.4	160/62.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	135/55.6	102/40.6	114/47.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	6/16.7	4/10.8	2/5.6
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34/20	33/19.1	32/19.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3/9.4	4/12.9	2/15.4
	English Language Learners	3/9.4	3/11.1	4/13.3
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26/22.8	31/27.4	33/29.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	5/20.8	2/9.5	3/13.6
	English Language Learners	6/16.7	5/15.2	7/21.2
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/100	89/81.7	87/88.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3/3	70/79.5	68/87.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/1.4	0/0	1/1.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/4.8	0/0	1/5.6
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/25	0/0	1/16.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/25	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82/40.6	86/39.8	69/45.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	6/23.1	4/13.3	4/16.7
	English Language Learners	5/15.2	4/9.8	4/18.2

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	7	33	35	12	12	8	7	14			
ELL	7	24	24	12	17	15	15	21			
ASN	71	58		53	33		75	70			
BLK	55	45									
HSP	37	37	31	23	16	12	39	54			

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	79	46									
WHT	65	48	38	51	23	20	74	77			
FRL	37	34	29	21	12	5	42	53			
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	10	21	21	19	23		29				
ELL	13	21	15	30	33	30	25				
ASN	67	53									
HSP	41	35	18	46	37	39	53				
WHT	63	46	32	67	42	34	86				
FRL	42	38	18	52	38	46	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	17	25	30								
ELL	10	36	44								
HSP	37	45	42	78	41	61	92				
WHT	61	52		80	47	45	87				
FRL	40	44	48	79	38	52	97				

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	20
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	60
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	50
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	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
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	50
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	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

ELL students had the lowest learning gains across the board. They only had a 15% learning gain in ELA and 30% in math. The ELA Grade 9 test has a 52% pass rate compared to the state's 55% pass rate. ELA Grade 10 had a 39% pass rate compared to the states 53% pass rate. Algebra had a 38% pass rate the state pass rate was 61%.

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

The data component that shows the greatest need for improvement is in math because our students scored 23% lower on the Algebra EOC compared to the state's average.

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

One of the largest factors contributing factors to the low pass rate was due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Many students attended classes virtually which limited their access to classroom resources and materials. It was also more difficult to assess student learning for the teacher when their students were behind a screen. Many students were out of school due to being sick with COVID-19 or out due to exposure.

This year school has taken action to improve test scores. Students are no longer attending classes virtually. All student assignments and progress monitoring tests are being given with fidelity. Teachers are getting more accurate data to drive their instruction. Students that did not score proficiently are getting extra math instruction during the school day. Our school also enlisted the school district to get professional development for math teachers. Bonita Springs High School offers after school tutoring for students who seek additional support.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is in Geometry. Bonita Springs High had a 67% pass rate compared to the state pass rate of 57%. Bonita Springs High scored 10% higher than the state average.

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

Bonita Springs High School will continue to promote high rigor instruction, professional development opportunities, and provide time for teachers to participate in professional learning communities. Teachers and administrators will continue to analyze progress monitoring reports and provide intervention and enrichment opportunities for students.

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

Teachers will need to continue following curriculum guides, provide standards-based instruction, and opportunities for enrichment and development.

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 and administrators attend district professional development and participate in professional learning communities weekly.

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

Additional services will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond. School personnel continues to attend professional development, teachers implement best practices, school leadership team meets monthly, we continue to progress monitor, and provide interventions for struggling students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students making learning gains in ELA will increase from 39% to 44% as measured by State Assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students making learning gains in ELA will increase from 39% to 44% as measured by State Assessment.
Monitoring:	School leaders will monitor exemplar data taken quarterly by the students to monitor their growth and process in the course. We will also be monitoring STAR data and use that to help drive instruction in the classroom. The ELA team meets weekly during PLC time to discuss common strengths and weaknesses. In addition, the ELA team has common planning to help further work on curriculum topics or concerns.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Urrely (monicamurr@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Team-Building Strategies (Kagan Cooperative Learning) Monthly PD training demonstrating Kagan Strategies for teachers to implement in their classroom. The goal will be to have teachers use the strategies learned with their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cooperative learning is a huge focus this year for our school. This strategy is a powerful alternative for language teaching - interaction. Many educators believe Kagan Structures are instructional strategies created to help promote and improve communication, student confidence and increase classroom interaction.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students proficient in math went down 14% as measured by EOC state assessment data. Additionally, the percentage of students in the bottom 25% for math learning gains, went down by 18%.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students proficient in Math will increase from 55% to 60% as measured by State Assessment. The percentage of Math lowest 25th percentile students making learning gains will increase from 38% to 48% as measured by State Assessment.
Monitoring:	School leaders will monitor exemplar data taken quarterly by the students to monitor their growth and process in the course. We will also be monitoring STAR data and use that to help drive instruction in the classroom. The math team meets weekly during PLC time to discuss common strengths and weaknesses. In addition, the math team has common planning to help further work on curriculum topics or concerns. We will be working closely with district to help ensure instructional practices are being used effectively in the classroom setting.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Drake (christophedd@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Team-Building Strategies (Kagan Cooperative Learning) Monthly PD training demonstrating Kagan Strategies for teachers to implement in their classroom. The goal will be to have teachers use the strategies learned with their students. We are currently piloting Algebra 1A/1B this year. We are working in a PLC with other schools to collaborate on best practices for that course.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cooperative learning is a huge focus this year for our school. This strategy is a powerful alternative for language teaching - interaction. Many educators believe Kagan Structures are instructional strategies created to help promote and improve communication, student confidence and increase classroom interaction.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 19 - 20 school year 53 out of 1407 students received an out-of-school suspension, as documented by the Early Warning System. During the 20 -21 school year 17 out of 1173.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 21- 22 school year, we would like to continue to see a 10% reduction rate in suspension as measured by quarterly data reviews during PLCs.
Monitoring:	Our Student Services team will pull quarterly data to measure the rate of suspensions for that quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Aldrich (michellerb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We saw a significant decrease in our suspension rate last school year. During a COVID year, many students opted to not return to campus and complete learning virtually. Staff and students did a great job working together during the difficult transition period of the school year. With 1,565 students on campus now, we are working towards keeping our suspension rate down by working together with families to help support them and their children.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	BSHS will continue to research best strategies through professional development, restorative practices, and building relationships with our students, to help develop and improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We choose to FOCUS on this area due to the high volume of tardies we experienced last year. in addition, we will also like to FOCUS our efforts on improving student attendance across the board.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students with an absence rate greater than 10% will decrease to 10% or less for the 2021 - 2022 school year.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Urrely (monicamurr@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Bonita Springs High School will work with families to help support them in getting their child to come to school on time. We will work with our social worker to support and communicate to families in the greatest need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is vital for students to be here on time and learning the standards being taught in their classes. Student attendance and tardiness are life lessons that we are supporting our kids in to help them to be future-ready.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We started our PBIS program this year. The purpose of this team is to help recognize and support student behaviors in the classroom and schoolwide.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of teachers implementing PBIS practices in our classroom will remain above 75% for the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	Weekly PLC meetings to discuss how PBIS is being implemented school-wide. Selected days built into the schedule allowing teachers to implement PBIS best practices with their students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Urrely (monicamurr@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monthly training for teachers to help support them on their PBIS journey.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBIS team has developed mini lessons to teach the expectations. The mini-lessons will lay out the behavior we need in all settings across the school campus to create a safe and positive learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Current data shows that we rank 342/505 schools in the state and 9/16 in the county. Data also shows we are reporting 3.8 incidents per 100 students when compared to all high schools statewide.

We have high marks in the violent incidents and drug/public order incidents. Although the alert shows "high" for these areas, we are currently averaging the following:
Violent Incidents - 1071 students only 15 incidents (1.4%)
Drug/Public Order Incidents - 1071 students only 26 incidents (2.4%)

We have low indicators in the property incidents, ranking #1 in the state and the county. This is a goal we will continue to strive for and maintain.

In order to help reduce the current data that is provided, we are have implanted different programs and safety measures for our staff and students. We have been fiscally responsible with our budget to ensure we have enough security guards on campus to help keep the hallways supervised. In addition, we are using different support resources at the school during the day to help keep our students and halls supervised. The goal is by keeping extra eyes on students during the school day, we can help reduce the number of violent crimes seen on or around campus.

One measure we have implemented in our school to help reduce student frequency of getting on their phones and accessing their backpacks is a school-wide backpack in the front of the room policy. All students are required to place their phones in their backpacks and place backpacks at the front of the room. This plan helps eliminate the frequency of students texting or getting into their backpacks for items during the class period. Additionally, we have reduced the number of restrooms opened during our passing periods. This helps ensure groups of students aren't grouping and gathering in the restrooms during bell change. We are also utilizing the prevention center and nicotine and prevention course program, to help support students who struggle with different addictions. Our counselors, school social workers, and SRO do a terrific job in helping educate these young students on the risk and dangers of different substances.

Our hope is through being vigilant and having open communication with our students frequently, we can help guide them and support them into making choices that will ultimately not lead to severe consequences. We take great pride in our school in setting the standard for excellence district-wide. We are hopeful that through a collaborative effort, we can improve the data numbers and live our mission and vision.

Educate, Engage, Enrich, and Inspire ALL students to be future-ready.

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.

Bonita Springs High School is implementing a positive behavior intervention and support system (PBIS). PBIS is a decision making framework that guides selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based behavioral practices for improving academic and behavior outcomes for all students. PBIS is a process for creating safer and more effective schools. It focuses on improving a school's ability to teach and support positive behavior for all students and is data-driven.

Our school has been following the following steps to intervention:
1. Establish a PBIS team
2. Develop a brief statement of behavior purpose
3. Identify positive school-wide behavior expectations
4. Develop procedures for teacher school-wide behavior expectations (our school has integrated lessons within our classrooms at various times throughout the year)
5. Develop procedures for teacher classroom-wide behavior expectations
6. Develop continuum of procedures for encouraging and strengthening student use of school- wide behavior expectations
7. Develop continuum of procedures for discouraging and strengthening student use of school- wide behavior expectations
8. Develop data-based procedures for monitoring implementation of PBIS

The PBIS team provides continuous professional development opportunities for stakeholders.

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

Monica Urrely- Assistant Principal
Michelle Aldrich- Assistant Principal
Marie Aulino- Spanish Teacher
Rodney Bell- Social Studies Teacher
Jennifer Biro- Guidance Secretary
Christine Bobick- Chorus/Theatre Teacher
Kelsey Britten- Social Worker
Barry Dickerson- JROTC Instructor
Annette Gallipo- Spanish Teacher
Jennifer Hopkins- ESE Teacher

Samantha Hunter- ELA Teacher
Melissa Jasczak- Science Teacher
Austin Kelly- Science Teacher
Thomas McGuire- Social Studies Teacher
Linda Mills- Security Specialist
Rebekah Olds- ESE Teacher
Bibiana Paez- Spanish Teacher
Autumn Phelps- Information Specialist
Tanis Sinnett- Social Studies Teacher
Ivanys Vasseur- Clerk Typist
Ernesto Villalobos- P.E. Teacher
Jessica Villalobos- Student Affairs Secretary

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00