

The School District of Lee County

Young Parent Education Program



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide
Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

Young Parent Education Program

3650 MICHIGAN AVE STE 2, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://lamp.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Mary Grace Romo

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2021

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Commendable 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

"To provide a nurturing academic environment that empowers and motivates students to become responsible, respectful, and productive parents in their communities."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"For all our students to become productive members of their community."

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Our students are either pregnant or are teen parents. We provide daycare at a nursery next door so our students can focus on learning without the worry of childcare. In order to help our students gain skills needed to meet our mission and vision statements, we provide parenting classes and also offer courses with certifications that can be used in the modern job-market. With our small class sizes, we are able to offer more individualized instruction for each student's needs compared with a typical high school.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Macchia, Susan	Assistant Principal	
Hiske, Angela	Teacher, K-12	

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

Yes

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/26/2021, Mary Grace Romo

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

8

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

10

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

48

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

1

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

1

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	2	2	8	14	22	48
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	7	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	13	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	13	18	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	0	0	2	0	5	13	18	38

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/6/2021

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	0	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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					55%	56%		55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					49%	51%		50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					37%	42%		42%	44%
Math Achievement					50%	51%		54%	51%
Math Learning Gains					45%	48%		43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					43%	45%		43%	45%
Science Achievement					62%	68%		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
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	18%	57%	-39%	56%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
10	2021					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	0%	46%	-46%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	56%	-56%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	11%	64%	-53%	70%	-59%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	59%	-59%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	8%	50%	-42%	57%	-49%

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
HSP											
FRL											
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
ELL											
HSP											
FRL				8							
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

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)	

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	5
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	9
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	81%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	0
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	0
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

The CASTLE early warning system.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

TBA after EWS stuff is filled in

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

The number of students with attendance below 90% is high for our school is high, however this is expected since we are a program for pregnant teens. Per state TAP guidelines if a mother or her child miss school due to health we cannot penalize them. Our next category with a high percentage of

students is "students displaying more than one indicator." This trend is due to the attendance.

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

As to be expected, attendance is tied to achievement. Since chronic absences are an issue at our program, the number of students scoring at a Level 1 is also an area of concern.

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

In addition to front office staff, teachers are participating in attendance enforcement by making daily phone calls to students, and then directing chronic absentees to the office. Attendance meetings with attendance contracts are being held. Teachers are utilizing Google Classroom for students who have to be out due to quarantine.

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.

There are monthly PLCs that focus on every student's achievement and attendance to identify students that need more focus.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Out of the 48 LAMP students, 38 students have been identified as being deficient in their reading scores and have not met the state reading score required to graduate. Of the 38 students, 18 are 12th graders out of the total twenty-two 12th graders enrolled. 82% of LAMP's 12th graders are at-risk of not graduating.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

During the 2021/2022 school year, we will decrease the % of non proficient students for 12th graders by 10%, from 82% to 72% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.
-Below (1,2) from 82% to 72% - 12 graders

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will complete baseline assessments and participate in progress monitoring assessments. Targeted goals for improvement for each students will be identified, developed and tracked by the instructional team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Macchia (susanem@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Interdisciplinary PLC teams will establish skill-based goals within their respective disciplines and design instruction, and assessments that measure student-competency on these individualized goals. Teams will report back student outcomes to their PLC interdisciplinary teams for guidance and support for student growth and development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Due to the diverse needs of the student LAMP population, skill-based goals may target not only the academic deficiency experienced by each student, but also by the social-emotional growth needs of each student. By focusing on the universal skills that they are teaching, teachers can build common assessments despite the differences in their content disciplines.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify the learning goals that the teams has in common.

Person Responsible

Angela Hiske (angelamhis@leeschools.net)

Focus on what is common and develop goal statements for each student.

Person Responsible

Angela Hiske (angelamhis@leeschools.net)

Identify the most important outcome. Develop a method of assessment that will identify student-level of competency of the goal.

Person Responsible

Angela Hiske (angelamhis@leeschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups

The specific subgroups being targeted are Hispanic and English Language Learners.

not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

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.

In order for our students to learn, their basic needs must be met. We do this by providing daycare for their children, providing transportation for appointments for the students and their children, and providing necessities such as food for home, clothing, diapers and wipes as needed. We also reinforce positive behavior through our PBS store. Students can earn 'butterfly bucks' to 'buy' a variety of items that appeal to young mothers. We've created an environment of understanding and nurturing through trauma-informed training, and teachers have adopted a learning-mindset language, where we emphasize that learning happens through trial and error and the first step to success is trying. Our culture is driven by our students' children and the common bond they all share in being mothers. When possible, teachers adapt their lessons to appeal to this culture, whether it's focusing on the baby's anatomy in science, learning about an empowering woman in history, or providing supplemental reading about parenting in reading class. The hope is to instill a love of learning in our students that they will pass on to their children.

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

The teachers and staff are the direct stakeholders that create a nurturing and empathetic environment aimed at the students' success. In the classroom, teachers adapt their teaching and lessons for individual student needs whenever possible. Our small population allows the teachers to get to know their students individually and to fulfill their individual needs, including remote learning while students are on post-partum leave or at home with a sick child. The supplemental staff ensures the students have their basic needs met by developing relationships with them and identifying where students have needs. Other stakeholders include the nursery staff, who ensure that the students' children are well cared for and safe that the mothers can focus their attention on their schoolwork. In addition, there are quarterly Parent-Involvement meetings where students participate in trainings aimed at parenting. Topics for these meetings are requested by the students themselves through surveys.

Input from stakeholders will be collected through surveys, discussions, and meeting notes.

These communications will be flexible in formats such as online, in person or on paper allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan. Stakeholders will be involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the school wide plan by

helping to create and review it
during SAC quarterly meetings.