

The School District of Lee County

# Harns Marsh Middle School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Harns Marsh Middle School

1820 UNICE AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Alex Dworzanski**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (48%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Harns Marsh Middle School

1820 UNICE AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://hmm.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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Every Student, Every Day, Gains Knowledge

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

To be a World Class Middle School. One Team/One Family.

### 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
Dworzanski, Alex	Principal	
Martin, Yolaine	Assistant Principal	
Restino, Joseph	Assistant Principal	
Gutierrez, Vivian	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 9/20/2020, Alex Dworzanski

**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.*

4

**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.*

28

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

91

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,373

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

23

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

23

## 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	443	436	496	0	0	0	0	1375
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	63	96	0	0	0	0	262
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	46	66	0	0	0	0	135
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	7	19	0	0	0	0	94
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	7	21	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	133	184	0	0	0	0	463
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	163	200	0	0	0	0	516
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	

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	165	137	192	0	0	0	0	494

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	5	0	0	0	0	17

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	424	425	460	0	0	0	0	1309	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	44	75	0	0	0	0	170	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	38	0	0	0	0	71	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	1	7	0	0	0	71	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	4	9	0	0	0	64	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	98	125	0	0	0	329	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	107	93	0	0	0	307	

**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	118	76	93	0	0	0	0	287

**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	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	12	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**2020-21 - Updated**
**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	424	425	460	0	0	0	0	1309	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	44	75	0	0	0	0	170	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	38	0	0	0	0	71	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	1	7	0	0	0	71	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	4	9	0	0	0	64	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	98	125	0	0	0	329	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	107	93	0	0	0	307	

**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	118	76	93	0	0	0	0	287

**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	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	55%	54%	41%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	56%	54%	52%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	44%	47%	41%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				52%	64%	58%	45%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains				63%	64%	57%	55%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	54%	51%	49%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				34%	50%	51%	39%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	70%	72%	68%	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	38%	52%	-14%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2021					
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	46%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	30%	46%	-16%	48%	-18%
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	64%	67%	-3%	71%	-7%
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	91%	59%	32%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

USATestPrep  
Performance Matters  
IReady

<b>Grade 6</b>				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	103/26.9	141/33.6	153/35.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/11.8	7/18.9	9/22.5
	English Language Learners	2/2.9	8/10.1	7/8.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45/22.5	69/33.2	73/34.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	1/9.1	3/25
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/2.9	3/7.7

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	119/42	146/45.1	155/45.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/10.5	3/13.6	3/12
	English Language Learners	3/6.5	8/14.3	13/21.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/25.9	116/28.4	129/31.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/5.7	3/7.3	2/4.8
	English Language Learners	10/13.7	11/12.6	14/15.6
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	127/42.1	177/53.2	220/69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/5	6/28.6	7/35
	English Language Learners	12/21.1	19/30.2	26/44.1

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	170/43.8	229/52	245/54.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/11.1	7/18.9	5/13.5
	English Language Learners	4/5.5	13/15.9	13/14.8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78/32.8	101/36.9	119/43.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/11.1	2/9.5	3/14.3
	English Language Learners	4/7.7	5/8.5	10/16.7
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82/23	131/29.9	200/47.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/9.5	1/2.7	5/14.7
	English Language Learners	1/1.6	5/6.2	16/19.8

## 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	28	27	13	28	32	12	20			
ELL	22	37	29	25	33	33	15	52	41		
BLK	28	34	22	23	28	38	33	48	56		
HSP	35	42	33	32	29	32	34	59	69		
MUL	54	37		29	19			42			
WHT	45	49	29	39	29	53	48	62	67		
FRL	33	38	25	29	28	35	33	53	65		
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	15	44	43	27	54	49	14	36			
ELL	25	47	40	39	67	69	15	51	56		
BLK	35	47	43	43	60	53	34	66	76		

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
HSP	42	52	43	53	65	60	31	67	75		
MUL	50	47		69	78			89			
WHT	52	61	54	58	57	48	48	70	83		
FRL	40	52	45	49	61	55	30	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	19	39	30	21	44	39	32	46			
ELL	23	50	46	30	53	53	17	61			
ASN	70	70		80	40						
BLK	31	47	35	33	48	37	25	64	58		
HSP	42	51	47	46	54	54	39	67	60		
MUL	53	66		47	66						
WHT	52	61	33	59	67	71	62	80	76		
FRL	38	51	41	42	53	48	36	65	68		

### 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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	33
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	39
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	47
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	36
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?

ELA & Math across grade levels and subgroups was underperforming  
 Science across progress monitoring also trended low  
 Most areas show low trends

As a school our learning gains were trending up.

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

Our ELA & Math Achievement was 10%+ below the district and state results. The progress monitoring also indicated these were weak areas, which we have been working strategically to improve. Our Science data also showed a significant deficit in the 2019 school year- progress monitoring & EOC results.

#### 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 these areas we can pinpoint a few contributing factors. As a school, we experience a high turnover rate; which results in, close to, half our staff being first year teachers &/or career changers. This was especially true for the 2019 school year. Our ELA and Science team collectively had an average of 7 or less years of teaching experience. As a school we also noticed a need for tighter PLC alignment and rigorous questioning.

Moving forward we have added to our coaching team: 3 PCTs, a math coach, and a Professional Development coach. As a school we have looked closely at our instructional model and have collaborated with our leaders to create instructional focuses for the new school year. With these instructional focuses, we have communicated the "why" & necessity to our staff, provided multiple PD opportunities. and utilized coaches for continuous support & feedback.

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

For the 2019 school year, our Civics students showed the most improvement.

Looking forward in the 2021 school year we are seeing growth in all areas, specifically our math, science, and civics. We are still monitoring reading and ELA closely.

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

PD on high effect strategies; creating our Marsh instructional focuses; PLC alignment; rigorous questioning

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

- Distributed Summarizing
- Questioning: intentional, leveled questions paired with writing
- Living Lesson Essential Question
- Collaborative Pairs

### **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.**

During Pre-week our school-wide PD was centered on the "Marsh Pillars": Living LEQ, Questioning, Distributed Summarizing. As the year has started we have utilized APPLES 1.0 to provide a deep dive for the instructional focuses, starting with LEQ.

As our ELA and Math teams have been learning the iReady program we have also had our district iReady trainer in our building to meet with our teams.

We have partnered with our Learning Focused consultant to provide specified PD

We have also been working closely with district supports in our ELA, Math, Science, & SS teams.

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

We have created The Marsh Way which maps out our school focuses. This is a combination of the Learning-Focused model and the Choosing Excellence program. This is a road map to our success. We have worked to identify our top priorities and the process for communication, PD, and accountability. Through this, our PLCs are becoming better aligned and we are hoping to see this trend continue! As a school we are moving into a strong focus on intentional, rigorous questioning in every classroom- pairing this with collaborative pairs and distributed practice. Through APPLES 1.0 & our PD coach, staff has opportunities to learn, practice, ask questions, & reflect.

We are shifting our staff culture to being continuous learners of the profession and keeping a growth-mindset. Our coaching team has been providing individual support as they work through coaching cycles with teachers. This includes modeling lessons and coteaching to support the teacher's needs. Throughout our building we are committed to equipping all teachers to become great!

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our ELA data has shown a downward trend across progress monitoring and the most recent FSA results.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our ELA goal is to increase our learning gains from 41% to 50% reflected in our student end of the year progress monitoring &/or FSA data
<b>Monitoring:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PLC SMART Goals &amp; data discussions by grade level teams with department administrator; using exemplar data &amp; progress monitoring assessment (iReady)</li> <li>- Comparing common assessment data &amp; utilizing the district Leading &amp; Learning meetings to share student outcomes</li> <li>- Department walkthroughs targeting our Marsh Instructional Pillars</li> <li>- Teacher support through PD (APPLES 1.0 &amp; 2.0) &amp; use of coaches</li> </ul>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Alex Dworzanski (alexjd@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Living LEQ</li> <li>- Intentional, Rigorous Questioning</li> <li>- Distributed Summarizing</li> <li>- Collaborative Pairs + Writing</li> <li>-Goal Setting + PDSA</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Based on the research from Learning-Focused, Hattie's Effective Strategies, &amp; Choosing Excellence we have narrowed it down to these main things. Effective questioning, in an LEQ or to stop and process learning, will bring huge gains to our classrooms (Hattie Effect Size &amp; Learning-Focused Strategies).</p> <p>Utilizing SMART Goals, based on the Choosing Excellence research, we are investing teachers and departments in their classroom success.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our Math data has shown a downward trend across progress monitoring and the most recent FSA results. After our 2021 diagnostic, our math students are on the right track.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our Math goal is to increase our learning gains from 29% to 38% reflected in our student end of the year progress monitoring &/or FSA data
<b>Monitoring:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PLC SMART Goals &amp; data discussions by grade level teams with department administrator; using exemplar data &amp; progress monitoring assessment</li> <li>- Comparing common assessment data &amp; utilizing the district Leading &amp; Learning meetings to share student outcomes</li> <li>- Department walkthroughs targeting our Marsh Instructional Pillars</li> <li>- Teacher support through PD (APPLES 1.0 &amp; 2.0) &amp; use of coaches</li> </ul>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Joseph Restino (josephmr@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Living LEQ</li> <li>- Intentional, Rigorous Questioning</li> <li>- Distributed Summarizing</li> <li>- Collaborative Pairs + Writing</li> <li>-Goal Setting + PDSA</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Based on the research from Learning-Focused, Hattie's Effective Strategies, &amp; Choosing Excellence we have narrowed it down to these main things. Effective questioning, in an LEQ or to stop and process learning, will bring huge gains to our classrooms (Hattie Effect Size &amp; Learning-Focused Strategies).</p> <p>Utilizing SMART Goals, based on the Choosing Excellence research, we are investing teachers and departments in their classroom success.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** District directive; we did not score as well last year in this area as we usually do

**Measurable Outcome:**

This year are goal is to see a 10% increase in this area. Taking our score up to 75%

**Monitoring:**

Our STAR data is being pulled & monitored, as well as the placement of students for these classes.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Joseph Restino (josephmr@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Living LEQ
- Intentional, Rigorous Questioning
- Distributed Summarizing
- Collaborative Pairs + Writing
- Goal Setting + PDSA

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Based on the research from Learning-Focused, Hattie's Effective Strategies, & Choosing Excellence we have narrowed it down to these main things. Effective questioning, in an LEQ or to stop and process learning, will bring huge gains to our classrooms (Hattie Effect Size & Learning-Focused Strategies). Utilizing SMART Goals, based on the Choosing Excellence research, we are investing teachers and departments in their classroom success.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://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 safeschoolsforalex.org, HMMS reports 4.3 incidents per 100 students; which categorizes as high in relation to statewide data.**

**Looking at all suspensions our school categorized as low, with 157 reported suspensions for the 19-20 school year. For the year, our in-school suspensions totalled 96 & out-of-school suspensions totalled 61. Statewide we are ranked 196/553. This data is from 2019.**

**Currently for the 2021 school year, we have 57 in-school suspensions & 32 out-of- school suspensions. With the number of suspensions we are seeing, our discipline team is working to provide additional opportunities to address behaviors before resulting in ISS/OSS when applicable. Starting in October we will have the funding to offer after-school detention in efforts to avoid suspensions.**

**Looking at our current school year, we recently handled an incident on campus involving a serious threat from two students. As we worked swiftly with our security team and school SRO, the threat was intercepted and handled flawlessly. As we gained national attention around this incident, Max Schachter commented on our schools safety and security procedures, via twitter, saying, "My son was murdered in the Parkland school shooting. Please thank Principal Alex Dworzanski for his attention to the safety and security off Harns Marsh Middle School students yesterday. Great Job!"**

#### **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. All department chairs, Administrators, School Counselors, and representatives from Support Staff participate each Friday in our Leadership team meeting. Each member (including the Principal) receives only one vote. This process creates input and a democratic process for each member to help shape our school's processes and procedures. Each member takes information from Leadership back to their PLC team. Each PLC then discusses any issue and possible changes. This has created an environment of continuous improvement and ownership. We also celebrate our achievements together and constantly provide support to each other when needed. Our theme of "One Team/One Family" is truly exemplified through monthly staff recognitions, teacher academic achievements, and opportunities for us to have family get togethers with food provided. This positive culture is also reflected through our lowered staff turnover..

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

As a school, we all have a voice in promoting a positive culture and learning environment. Every Friday our school-based leaders (department heads, administration, and coaches) meet to discuss the school climate, student success, and instructional focuses. Each member has an opportunity to bring forth ideas and concerns from their team &/or experiences. As members of the Leadership Team, each person is given an equal vote and voice as we discuss school-wide process, expectations, and initiatives. Even the Principal only gets one vote in this truly School Based Leadership process. As processes and procedures are discussed, they are then taken back to their respective departments for discussion. In this fashion, all stakeholders have a chance to be heard and give input. During PLC, department heads share talking points from the Leadership meeting and open the floor to bring back feedback the following week. This process creates a clear path of communication, which has played a vital role in maintaining our positive staff morale.

Our guidance team also plays a role in the positive environment created for our students. Each grade level has their own guidance counselor to support the academic and emotional wellness of our students. Students can submit a digital request to sit with their counselor at any time and they will be sent a pass with an appointment time. Additionally, our students also have access to our Career Specialist, who is a resource for their future plans. Students can sit with her to discuss plans for high school, scholarship opportunities, and career readiness as they start to think about their future. Through this our students experience additional support in their overall success and are able to keep a positive outlook in school.

## **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: Math	\$0.00

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------