
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bonita Springs Middle Center For The Arts

10141 W TERRY ST, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

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

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Layner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bonita Springs Middle Center For The Arts

10141 W TERRY ST, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>77%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>75%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

Expanding Minds, Strengthening Bodies, Nurturing Souls for Career and College-Ready Success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building a Community of Career and College-Ready Learners through Academics and the Arts

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
Layner, Melissa	Principal	Coordinate all school operations, curriculum and parent involvement. School improvement responsibilities include coordinating members of the team and overseeing responsibilities.
Ramos, Virginia	Assistant Principal	Provide data for meeting school wide goals involving student services and parent involvement.
Lightfoot, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Oversee all curriculum matters, to include scheduling, text resources, lesson planning and professional learning communities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Melissa Layner

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.*

6

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

883

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

15

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

16

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	264	294	325	0	0	0	0	883
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	43	62	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	25	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	8	11	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	4	12	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	66	102	0	0	0	0	216
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	46	87	0	0	0	0	172
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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	50	46	91	0	0	0	0	187

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	267	286	276	0	0	0	0	829
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	18	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	10	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	2	7	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	1	9	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	65	64	0	0	0	0	169
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	45	35	0	0	0	0	120

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	43	38	37	0	0	0	0	118

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

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	267	286	276	0	0	0	0	829
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	18	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	10	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	2	7	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	1	9	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	65	64	0	0	0	0	169
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	45	35	0	0	0	0	120

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	43	38	37	0	0	0	0	118

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

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%	55%	54%	54%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	56%	54%	54%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	44%	47%	32%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				68%	64%	58%	64%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains				66%	64%	57%	64%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	54%	51%	55%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				44%	50%	51%	53%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	70%	72%	76%	69%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	63%	47%	16%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	57%	2%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2021					
	2019	47%	60%	-13%	46%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	42%	46%	-4%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	67%	67%	0%	71%	-4%

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	98%	59%	39%	61%	37%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

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 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	84/34.3	111/41.4	127/47.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/16	7/25	7/25.9
	English Language Learners	7/14	10/18.5	12/21.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25/14	72/35.5	71/35.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.8	3/12.3	4/16.7
	English Language Learners	1/1.9	7/11.3	8/12.9

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	86/32.2	133/45.5	148/50.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/11.4	6/15.4	8/20
	English Language Learners	3/4.1	11/14.3	10/13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42/27.8	67/38.1	76/43.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/15.4	4/13.3	6/20.7
	English Language Learners	3/6.1	8/14.5	9/16.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	107/44.2	170/57.2	209/71.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9/29	15/40.5	26/74.3
	English Language Learners	12/16.7	20/25.3	31/40.3

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		135/52.3	175/63.6	200/70.4
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		5/17.9	12/37.5	18/54.5
	English Language Learners		7/14	10/18.5	12/21.8
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		12/17.9	25/36.2	25/36.2
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		2/20	4/33.3	2/66.7
	English Language Learners		3/12.5	5/100	4/80
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		96/37.9	131/47.8	175/64.9
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		6/20	9/27.3	13/41.9
	English Language Learners		2/4	6/11.8	15/29.4

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	21	32	40	35	43	43	21	51	27		
ELL	21	38	38	45	51	50	20	47	59		
ASN	77	91		92	64						
BLK	58	60		67	50						
HSP	42	44	39	55	47	48	42	64	69		
WHT	67	55	57	72	54	50	71	89	82		
FRL	44	45	41	57	49	45	46	65	67		
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	24	44	35	33	54	57	12	44	47		
ELL	26	40	29	44	51	47	16	42	59		
ASN	87	71		93	93						

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
BLK	62	58		62	68						
HSP	46	50	34	59	59	49	31	66	70		
MUL	80			100							
WHT	72	68	40	87	80	63	69	92	83		
FRL	48	51	35	62	63	54	32	67	71		
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	15	32	21	27	45	46	11	55			
ELL	12	32	29	26	53	56	15	45			
ASN	93	67		100	80						
BLK	70	65		67	55						
HSP	43	47	32	55	59	56	38	68	69		
MUL	58	55		83	91						
WHT	76	69	38	82	73	48	81	89	94		
FRL	47	49	31	57	60	56	46	71	74		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	41
---	----

English Language Learners	
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	81
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	59
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	49
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	
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	66
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	50
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?

While the school is often below the district level achievement in ELA proficiency and gains, improvement has been shown from year to year. Significant improvement has been shown for our ELA L25 population. Sixth and seventh grade math typically perform at or above the district level, but eighth grade math has been a challenging area. Science continues to show improvement from year to year and Civics is always in the top ranking.

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

ELA proficiency and 8th grade math overall need to show improvement.

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

In regard to ELA and Math, the majority of our students enter sixth grade significantly below grade level. Working in conjunction with feeder elementary schools would be a positive experience for all of our students. Also, improving our spiral teaching process in all grade levels would build strong foundations to help achieve at the next grade level.

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

We are especially proud of our ELA L25 improvements over time.

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

Strong teaching practices in ELA contributed to this trend, but we also use many curriculum resources to improve student learning, to include Rosetta Stone, Duolingo, Everyday English, iReady and System 44.

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

Strong data-based professional learning communities must continue to drive our instructional processes. Team planning of lessons with frequent data reviews are also a must.

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.

1. Thursday trainings on all current educational trends and programs
2. Data chats and data walks
3. Instructional coaching following learning walks
4. ESOL strategy training
5. SWD strategy training
6. MTSS training

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

Individual student conferencing process

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Over several years, ELA grade 7 has performed lower than other grades. When looking at grade level, subgroup and district comparison data, it is clear to see that the area needs improvement. Proficiency and learning gains in this area shows great need for intervention.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, Bonita Springs Middle school overall 7th grade FSA scores will be at 50% or more proficiency.

Monitoring:

1. Data chats with 7th grade teachers
2. Exemplar data analysis and planning for improvement
3. Individual student growth plans

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Layner (melissaal@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Close reading
iReady practice
Schoolwide distributive summary activities

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All three listed strategies have been cultivated and ingrained in our school culture over several years. All students are familiar with these strategies.

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: A large population of our eighth grade students are enrolled in either Algebra or Pre-Algebra. Our 8th grade Pre-Algebra students achieve at a much lower level, compared to their peers and the district. Learning gains in this area have not seen significant improvement over time.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2021-2022 school year, our eighth grade Pre-Algebra students with disabilities will achieve a proficiency rating of 40% or more as measured by the FSA Math test.

Monitoring: Regular meetings with our 8th grade Pre-Algebra teachers, during PLC's and individually. We use data from our spiralized bell ringers to monitor how students are grasping content. Standards-based exemplar data is monitored to measure how our students are understanding content and how they are performing compared to peers at other schools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Lightfoot (christopherml@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Spiral teaching
iReady
Peer tutoring
Standards-based instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies account for our improvement over time and are ones all of our math teachers use, most of whom show growth in their data.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Algebra students earn us the majority of acceleration points. Our industry certification does contribute to that, but not at a significant rate. In addition, our SWD and ELL populations contribute significantly fewer points to our acceleration points than their white or hispanic peers.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, our Students with Disabilities will show 50% proficiency as measured on their industry certification testing.

Monitoring:

1. District specialist meets with teacher monthly/quarterly.
2. Our assistant principal over CTE, Virginia Ramos, monitors standards and skill mastery for these students.
3. Monthly data chats between industry certification and Administrative Dean are data-driven.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Virginia Ramos (virginiara@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-based instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: CTE standards are different than traditional standards, but a plan is in place to monitor them.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

While the SafeSchoolsforAlex site have our school ranked as "High" or "Very High", we do not have significant behavioral concerns. Our in-school and out-of-school suspensions have been greatly reduced over several years, decreasing every year. The data reported on that site could be based on the SESIR codes used. Tobacco/vaping in our campus is a concern, but nowhere near an alarming rate. Likewise, violent behaviors were ranked high and those are quite minimal at our school.

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.

The School District of Lee County 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.

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

All school administration oversees the PBIS program and monitors high-reliability components. The principal engages stakeholders through the School Advisory Committee and Parent-Teacher Organization. All teachers provide input through the use of Castle, Focus, and school and district processes involving at-risk populations. Administration monitors survey data to ensure feedback is received from all stakeholders and addressed appropriately.

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: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00