
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	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lehigh Acres Middle School

651 SUNRISE BLVD., Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

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

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Freeman

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

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	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)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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	0

Lehigh Acres Middle School

651 SUNRISE BLVD., Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">84%</p>

School Grades History

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

To create a unique learning environment that prepares the whole child for life experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering lifelong learners to thrive in a global community

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
Gibson, Brian	Principal	
Lewis, Vincent	Assistant Principal	
Thomas, Lisanne	Assistant Principal	
Plucker, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Fine, Mary	Dean	
Teixeira, Miguel	Instructional Coach	
Smith, Alana	Instructional Coach	
Schultz, Scott	Math Coach	
Shaw, Taylie	Magnet Coordinator	
Neal, Misty	Instructional Coach	
Krell, Rebecca	Reading Coach	
Jackson, Elsie	Parent Engagement Liaison	
Tyler, Emily	Teacher, K-12	
Rodriguez, Lynette	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/1/2019, Michelle Freeman

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

1

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

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

101

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,277

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

16

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

22

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	330	431	516	0	0	0	0	1277
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	46	119	0	0	0	0	247
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	41	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	14	30	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	8	46	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	135	189	0	0	0	0	418
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	152	199	0	0	0	0	461
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	106	119	196	0	0	0	0	421

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	16	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	15

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	403	487	411	0	0	0	0	1301
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	23	33	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	45	28	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	1	20	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	2	6	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	118	118	0	0	0	0	331
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	121	97	0	0	0	0	305

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	88	95	86	0	0	0	0	269

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	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

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	403	487	411	0	0	0	0	1301
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	23	33	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	45	28	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	1	20	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	2	6	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	118	118	0	0	0	0	331
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	121	97	0	0	0	0	305

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	88	95	86	0	0	0	0	269

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	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

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				43%	55%	54%	39%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	56%	54%	45%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	44%	47%	39%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				46%	64%	58%	45%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains				53%	64%	57%	53%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	54%	51%	41%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				32%	50%	51%	35%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				60%	70%	72%	53%	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	41%	52%	-11%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	52%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2021					
	2019	41%	57%	-16%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	39%	47%	-8%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	31%	57%	-26%	54%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2021					
	2019	43%	60%	-17%	46%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

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	57%	67%	-10%	71%	-14%

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	88%	59%	29%	61%	27%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	50%	50%	57%	43%

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	100/28.7	111/28.6	165/41
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/5.4
	English Language Learners	2/5.7	2/4.3	5/9.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56/15.4	84/23.9	135/34.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	4/10.8
	English Language Learners	1/2.4	2/4	5/9.6

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	94/27.1	130/31.1	190/46.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/8.8	6/12.8	7/15.2
	English Language Learners	3/6.8	7/14.6	15/28.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	98/33	115/33.1	147/44.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/10	4/9.1	8/18.6
	English Language Learners	3/8.6	3/7.7	7/18.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	116/34.6	175/46.8	210/59
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/13.9	12/25.5	14/31.1
	English Language Learners	10/20	12/24	21/42.9

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		138/41.7	177/48.6	232/60.1
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		3/14.3	3/10.7	4/13.8
	English Language Learners		4/10.3	7/16.3	11/25
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		109/46.6	114/41.5	137/50
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		1/5.6	1/4.3	0/0
	English Language Learners		5/16.7	7/20.6	10/30.3
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		83/23.6	130/33.5	165/42.9
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	3/10.7	2/6.9
	English Language Learners		3/7.1	5/11.4	7/15.9

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	5	26	32	7	16	20	10	31			
ELL	20	44	50	21	31	31	19	44	43		
ASN	55	55		82	55						
BLK	34	45	41	26	26	23	23	49	68		
HSP	36	47	48	34	34	34	30	54	60		
MUL	43	39		46	31		64	53	60		
WHT	42	41	26	47	43	53	55	55	76		
FRL	32	42	42	29	31	32	26	49	59		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	31	27	17	37	31	11	30			
ELL	25	40	32	38	53	51	16	48	38		

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
ASN	75	69		90	63			90			
BLK	35	42	34	35	48	38	18	53	51		
HSP	42	47	31	46	53	49	34	61	67		
MUL	33	50	36	47	53		31	29			
WHT	57	63	42	59	56	50	46	70	81		
FRL	39	46	33	40	49	46	30	55	60		

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	10	25	26	14	40	32	10	16			
ELL	13	37	39	27	44	34	2	26			
ASN	71	43		77	77						
BLK	32	44	42	35	47	37	24	53	64		
HSP	39	43	35	45	52	41	34	50	70		
MUL	33	54		48	65			30			
WHT	46	51	50	57	63	53	50	65	61		
FRL	37	43	38	43	52	41	32	52	69		

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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	34
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	62
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	37
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	42
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	48
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	49
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	37
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?

Science showed the lowest performance with 32% proficiency. Proficiency decreased from 35% the 2017-2018 school year to 32% the 2018-2019 school year. The trend shows a steady decrease in proficiency year to year. Contributing factors include teacher turnover and accountability among initiatives.

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

Learning gains of the reading bottom quartile showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a 5% decrease. We do not have a specific program that addresses the bottom 25%.

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

Science, with 32% proficiency, had the largest gap when compared to the state average of 51%. The 19% discrepancy is due to factors that include contributing factors include teacher turnover and accountability among initiatives.

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

Civics showed the most improvement from 53% proficiency to 60%; a 7% improvement.

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

The Civics team implemented strategies to increase proficiency including: pinpointing level two students for intensive remediation, exposing students to practice EOC type questions daily, implementing student reflection sheets based on standards, student data tracking, and using the PLC process to plan remediation and enrichment of standards. The team based instruction on district and formative data gathered quarterly throughout the school year.

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

Teams continue to focus on implementation of high yield strategies promoted by the district to accelerate learning, including writing to learn, distributed summaries and numbered partners. Additionally, school wide AVID strategies and Kagan engagement strategies are used. Teams

administer formative exemplars regularly which guide instruction, acceleration and remediation in each core class.

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.

Staff and faculty attend AVID professional development. Lehigh schedules PD weekly on Thursdays based on a quarterly needs assessment survey. In quarter 1, PD has addressed PLC, AVID strategies, high yield strategies and engagement strategies, as well as understanding IEPs, 504s and the MTSS process.

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

The school provides and will continue to provide after school tutoring in each discipline with a certified teacher. We have also begun to look at our indicators as outlined in High Reliability Schools.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase learning gains in reading and ELA as measured by FY22 FSA results.
Measurable Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -LAMS will increase students scoring proficiency in reading from 37% to 40%, as determined by the year FY22 ELA FSA. -LAMS will increase the number of students making learning gains from 45% to 48%, as measured by the year FY22 ELA FSA. -LAMS lowest 25% in Reading will increase learning gains from 43% to 46%, as measured by the FY 22 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intervention classes in both math and reading for our L25 population. Homeroom class for both math and reading progress monitoring IReady Homeroom class for individual data chats with students
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lynette Rodriguez (lynnetted@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on L25 for intervention in math and reading Exemplar formatives for instructional guidance using IReady AVID strategies school wide
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting district focus on L25 IReady diagnostic and individual paths for remediation and acceleration AVID ensures high yield strategies school wide

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identification
 2. Professional development
 3. Data chats
 4. Use of IReady for progress monitoring
 5. Closely monitor ESSA subgroup data and increase supports as needed
- Person Responsible** Lynette Rodriguez (lynnetted@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase proficiency and learning gains in math so that students are able to master the standards.
Measurable Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LAMS will increase students scoring proficiency in math from 34% to 37%, as determined by the FY22 Math FSA -LAMS will increase learning gains in math from 33% to 36%, as determined by the FY22 Math FSA -LAMS lowest 25% in Math will increase learning gains from 33% to 36%, as measured by the FY22 Math FSA
Monitoring:	District progress monitoring IReady will be used to monitor student progress District provided exemplars will assess standard mastery
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Schultz (scottps@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Implement iReady and ALEKS for remediation and enrichment. Homeroom teachers will have data chats with each student as they track their standards based on exemplar assessments. PLCs will meet during common planning time to create lessons, homework assignments, and assessments.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ALEKS and IReady will be utilized for remediation and enrichment -Data chats are imperative to have with the students, so that they understand where they are in class and in their learning -PLCs and planning together is a district initiative -iReady will enable teachers to make data driven instructional decisions to target learning gaps and provide enrichment opportunities -Closely monitor low performing ESSA subgroup data and increase support when data indicates need

Action Steps to Implement

IReady 45 minute weekly goal to be met through homeroom administration
 Data chats held on Mondays in homeroom
 PLC to discuss data and make instructional decisions based on the data.
 Closely monitor ESSA sub groups in data analysis and increase support as warranted.

Person Responsible Scott Schultz (scottps@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: To increase the number of students offered acceleration based on eligibility

Measurable Outcome:

Lehigh Acres Middle will increase the number of students offered access to advanced classes both through Algebra and Cambridge curriculum from 65% of eligible students to 85% of eligible students.

Monitoring:

Following the districts progression plans, students have been placed in classes based on data from the 20-21 FSA. Students with a level 3+ on the 7th grade math FSA have been offered Algebra in 8th grade. Further, students with FSA 4+ ELA score have been placed in Cambridge curriculum classes for English and Science. Student grades are monitored through ALEKS and exemplars for Algebra and exemplars for English and Science by the Cambridge Coordinator for English and Science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisanne Thomas (lisannet@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

ALEKS Topic driven curriculum
Cambridge Curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

District data supports offering students opportunity to stretch their learning enabling success for our high achieving students.

Action Steps to Implement

Students identified using FSA Data
Monitoring of grades and exemplars

Person Responsible

Lisanne Thomas (lisannet@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase proficiency in science as data indicates that student achievement needs to increase in this area.

Measurable Outcome: LAMS will increase the number of students earning proficiency in Science from 33% to 36%, as measured by the FY22 Statewide Science Assessment

Monitoring: District created exemplars for progress monitoring will be used

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Misty Neal (mistyln@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Spiraling of annually assessed benchmarks
Remediation to reflect data from common assessments
Standards-based Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To increase the scores in the science department, students will need more targeted strategies and interventions to respond to data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will teach standards based instruction with fidelity.
2. Teachers will remediate and enrich when necessary.
3. Teachers will reteach standards all year long.
4. Closely monitor ESSA subgroup data and increase supports when data indicates need.

Person Responsible Misty Neal (mistyln@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase proficiency in social studies standards

Measurable Outcome: Lehigh Acres Middle will increase the number of students earning proficiency in Civics from 53% to 56%, as measured by the FY22 Civics EOC

Monitoring: District created exemplars will used to track standards acquisition

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Miguel Teixeira (migueltdt@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common planning to create common assessments, instruction, remediation and enrichment
Standards based instruction
Data driven decision making based on exemplars.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students require targeted strategies and interventions based on a response to data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will teach standards based instruction with fidelity
2. Teachers will remediate and enrich as the data supports.
3. Standards will be taught all year long.

Person Responsible Miguel Teixeira (migueltdt@leeschools.net)

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.

According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex site, Lehigh Acres Middle School ranked very high for violent incidents, very high for property incidents, and high for drug/public order incidents for the 2019-2020 school year. This was above the statewide average in all three areas.

In adopting the high reliability schools model, one of the first items to address is the perception of school safety by the school community and the community at large. We have begun this initial process through conducting several staff and community surveys. Once this data has been analyzed, targeted strategies will be used to ameliorate the leading indicators presented. This will be followed by additional monitoring and surveys in a methodical process to increase safety and security in our building.

We have instituted scheduled SEL curriculum administration through Mindful Mondays during homeroom class. The purpose is to create more empathy and understanding among students, as well as to offer strategies for addressing difficult situations and circumstances that present during middle school years. The goal is to reduce the number of incidents of conflict for our students.

Lehigh Middle employs a teacher for Peer Counseling who also serves as a Peer Mediation facilitator. This teacher helps students resolve conflict and addresses the underlying issues that compound situations for our student population. Additionally, Lehigh ascribes to Restorative Practice. The Restorative team meets weekly to discuss the discipline process and the restorative strategies that will be employed.

Our parent and family engagement plan outlines the many ways we endeavor to increase parent involvement in our school through multiple opportunities for our school community to participate in functions and event. Parent involvement has been proven to mitigate many discipline issues in a school. Offering many possible events will increase our parent involvement.

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.

Lehigh Acres Middle has been the fortunate recipient of a federal magnet grant which has been used to support a STEAM curriculum school wide. The intent of this STEAM focus has been to shift the school to higher academic achievement by attracting students interested in STEAM in our school enrollment lottery system.

Lehigh Acres Middle has begun to execute the plan outlined in Marzano's High Reliability Schools. Marzano's system offers a clear path to evaluating identified components of a high reliability school. Once a school identifies indicators in which a school's performance falls short, the plan defines concrete strategies to monitor and target elements of performance. The leading indicators are: (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. Lehigh administration has been collaborating with our leadership team to begin initial steps to becoming a high reliability school.

Additionally, the Lehigh team has regular team building outings and staff appreciation occurs bimonthly through family style breakfast on the last Friday of the month and various tokens of appreciation every other week.

Through our homeroom class, every Monday is devoted to SEL curriculum (Second Step) school wide. Implementing a proven, research based curriculum will help students for whom life has been interrupted by a world wide pandemic reintegrate into school socialization.

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

The school works with community partners, families, administrators, teachers, staff, and students to promote a positive culture and environment.

Our community partners regularly contribute to teacher appreciation events, as well as, volunteering for student events and outings to maintain safety and security. Families participate in student events and support our curriculum evenings outlined in the parent and family engagement plan. Administrators, teachers, staff and students work together to establish an environment that is welcoming and engaging for our scholars.