

The School District of Lee County

Lexington Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

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	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Lexington Middle School

16351 SUMMERLIN RD, Fort Myers, FL 33908

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristin Bueno

Start Date for this Principal: 9/17/2021

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)	95%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%)
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	25

Lexington Middle School

16351 SUMMERLIN RD, Fort Myers, FL 33908

<http://lxm.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>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>70%</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>60%</p>

School Grades History

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

Lexington Middle School Mission Statement: Lexington Middle School will provide each student the opportunity to develop the educational skills, knowledge, attitude, and character to become compassionate, lifelong learners with an intercultural understanding and respect in order to make a positive impact in the community and the world.

IB Mission Statement: The International Baccalaureate aims to develop inquiring knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect. To this end, the organization works with schools, governments, and international organizations to develop challenging programs of international education and rigorous assessment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lexington Middle School Vision Statement: To become a world class middle school.

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
Bueno, Kristin	Principal	Facilitate the learning of all students by leading the staff and faculty.
Sanders, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	
Anderson, Ben	Teacher, K-12	
Kroll, James	Instructional Coach	IB Coordinator
Beecroft, Alaina	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coordinator
Allen, Tony	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/17/2021, Kristin Bueno

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,113

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

21

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

15

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	365	370	377	0	0	0	0	1112
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	43	52	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	24	22	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	2	4	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	9	10	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	77	91	0	0	0	0	217
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	91	90	0	0	0	0	243
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	59	75	85	0	0	0	0	219

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	4	3	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/20/2021

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	361	343	337	0	0	0	0	1041
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	28	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	14	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	8	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	15	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	59	67	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	46	47	0	0	0	0	138

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	36	49	53	0	0	0	0	138

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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	361	343	337	0	0	0	0	1041
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	28	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	14	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	8	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	15	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	59	67	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	46	47	0	0	0	0	138

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	36	49	53	0	0	0	0	138

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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				61%	55%	54%	59%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	56%	54%	54%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	44%	47%	40%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				71%	64%	58%	70%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains				69%	64%	57%	64%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	54%	51%	46%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				49%	50%	51%	58%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				80%	70%	72%	81%	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	55%	52%	3%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	57%	51%	6%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	63%	57%	6%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	48%	47%	1%	55%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	54%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2021					
	2019	70%	60%	10%	46%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	47%	46%	1%	48%	-1%
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	75%	67%	8%	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	93%	59%	34%	61%	32%
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.

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	136/43.9	164/50.6	155/46.8
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	1/2.4	5/11.6	6/13.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/5.4	3/7.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	107/32.9	132/39.1	152/43.9
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	4/8.7	7/15.9	9/19.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/100	1/100

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	93/57.4	113/60.1	124/65.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/16.7	1/7.1	7/43.8
	English Language Learners	1/11.1	2/16.7	3/21.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	141/45.6	168/49.4	180/51.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	6/18.2	7/18.4	8/20
	English Language Learners	2/6.5	2/5.6	5/13.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	116/39.6	191/55.2	212/63.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	6/20	6/17.6	11/33.3
	English Language Learners	3/11.1	5/14.3	10/28.6

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		112/56.6	147/67.4	153/68.9
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		7/33.3	9/39.1	10/41.7
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		101/52.3	136/60.4	153/66.5
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		5/27.8	9/42.9	11/50
	English Language Learners		2/10	3/13	4/17.4
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		97/32.2	145/44.5	185/54.9
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		2/8.3	3/11.1	7/23.3
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	1/2.8

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	21	29	26	31	32	30	33	39	27		
ELL	22	44	38	21	29	31	16	40			
ASN	82	68		91	68		70		79		
BLK	39	44	42	37	34	31	32	57	57		
HSP	43	46	33	44	41	41	34	54	40		
MUL	73	68		78	40						
WHT	68	60	39	73	50	39	70	85	71		
FRL	40	44	30	40	35	34	34	59	45		
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	40	32	34	50	52	13	46	60		
ELL	25	39	32	43	59	58	24	32	53		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	78	71		89	80		75	85	92		
BLK	43	50	34	47	58	57	35	67	79		
HSP	50	49	38	59	61	59	33	67	64		
MUL	76	56		94	80						
WHT	73	64	55	85	77	64	62	91	72		
FRL	49	53	42	58	61	58	39	69	63		

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	21	37	33	27	41	41	19	37			
ELL	16	44	42	29	51	49	18	56			
ASN	81	71		86	74		55	100			
BLK	40	40	25	46	52	45	37	67	75		
HSP	44	50	42	58	52	43	39	73	82		
MUL	79	78		79	56						
WHT	70	58	46	81	73	53	69	87	73		
FRL	43	46	35	57	54	44	40	68	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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	514
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	32
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	76
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	41
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	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	65
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	62
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	41
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?

The first emerging trend indicates a need for additional support for students with disabilities and English language learners. These two groups consistently score the lowest across multiple subject areas, according to state assessment data. (ELA achievement: SWD - 24%, ELL - 25%; Math achievement: SWD - 34%, ELL: 43%). Progress Monitoring data indicates these subgroups continue to struggle on standardized tests.

This is also an important opportunity for growth, especially among these populations who also fall into the lowest 25 percentile in ELA and math. There have been sharp increases in these two categories (ELL L25 2018 - 32%, up 10 points to 42% in 2019). In math, the numbers of ELL L25 students who made learning gains increased from 49% to 58%. Students with disabilities who made learning gains in math increased from 41% to 52%.

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

Based on progress monitoring and state assessments our main opportunities for growth are science achievement and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. On the science FCAT, 49% of students scored between a 3-5. Among students in the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile, 41% of students showed learning gains.

Lexington also continues its goal to increase student achievement among core classes, including Math learning gains (69% in 2019), ELA learning gains (57% in 2019), proficiency in sixth-grade math (48% in 2019); and acceleration on the Algebra EOC (93% in 2019).

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

A major contributing factor was teacher turnover. The 2018-19 school year saw several new teachers join the school in the science, reading and ELA departments. Two of the three eighth-grade teachers were new to the school and had not taught the FCAT eighth-grade course before. We expect continued growth as the team continues to improve its collaborative working relationship. The 2021-22 FCAT will be the first year students have taken science classes every day for three years (previously, sixth- and seventh-grade classes were on an alternating schedule). School- or district-based professional development on instruction and assessment for students with disabilities and English language learners would likely improve student success, as those subgroups have struggled on the science FCAT. (2019 ELL - 24%, SWD - 13%)

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

Students in the lowest 25% of math achievement who showed learning gains improved 14 percentage points, from 46% on the 2019 FSA to a 60% rate of students showing learning gains.

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

Several factors contributed to this improvement. Ongoing progress monitoring allowed teachers to access student data and remediate immediately. The school provided after-school tutoring specifically aimed at struggling students as well as scheduling consistent support from paraprofessionals in the classroom, which allowed for more small-group and one-on-one instruction. These actions contributed to growth in success among students with disabilities (L25 learning gains +11%) and English language learners (L25 learning gains +9%).

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

Teachers will continue to use technology as a tool to accelerate learning. Math, and Reading/ELA use the iReady diagnostic and learning paths to assess student understanding and growth in real time. Teachers are able to collaborate on appropriate remediation. The school has continued its accelerated math program, with high-performing sixth-graders taking seventh-grade math with an endpoint of earning high school credit on the Algebra End of Course assessment. Math teachers are in the second year of looping with high-performing students to accelerate their growth and maximize instructional time.

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.

One of the most important approaches the school can take to accelerate learning is to provide highly reliable instruction in all classrooms. To ensure that all teachers, including new teachers, have the capacity to provide powerful instruction, the school provides a bevy of training around best practices in technology, classroom management and PBIS, and instruction through the APPLES program. For veteran teachers, the school will continue its optional professional development for International Baccalaureate instruction and assessment. This dynamic training provides an opportunity for teachers to improve their skills and learn cutting edge assessment techniques. School and district personnel will continue training on necessary technology to promote success using iReady and other instructional technology. Leading and Learning teachers will lead department PLCs with the most up-to-date information from district leadership.

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

The school is implementing a series of high-reliability practices. Teachers have dedicated time on a weekly basis to meet in collaborative teams to plan, review assessment data, and create remediation for students who need additional support. The school has budgeted for an additional security specialist to keep students in class and on-task, as well as a full-time intervention specialist to support the collaborative team process.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math FSA and EOC scores. School grade components aligned to Envision 2030. The data from section II indicates a clear need for increased support for proficiency and learning gains in mathematics. Additionally, while the data from section II indicates an increase in mathematics learning gains among some groups from 2018-2019, progress monitoring data from the 2020-2021 school year reaffirms the need to focus on increased instructional support in mathematics.

Measurable Outcome: Math learning gains increase from 2019's 69% to 74% as measured by FSA and EOC exams.

Monitoring: Learning gains will be monitored through Collaborative Team Time (CTT) Reflection documents, CTT observations, iReady progress reports, district exemplar results, and teacher designed formative assessments. Additionally, members of the pedagogical leadership team will undertake quarterly reviews of the data gathered and analyzed during the above monitoring sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady will be used to both monitor growth and provide differentiated support. Additionally, intervention and enrichment plans will be created based on formative and summative assessment results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Assessment data will help to identify students struggling to make learning gains as related to standards and curriculum goals. Differentiation provided by both iReady and school-based intervention will increase support for struggling students.

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS interventions for at risk students

Person Responsible Alaina Beecroft (alainarb@leeschools.net)

Quarterly review of exemplar data for mathematics

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Quarterly review of iReady data for mathematics

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Parent and family communication

Person Responsible Tiffany Sanders (tiffanym@leeschools.net)

Classroom rewards, celebrations, and incentives.

Person Responsible Tiffany Sanders (tiffanym@leeschools.net)

Monitor students with disability data and provide support when data indicates.

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA FSA scores. School grade components aligned to Envision 2030. The data from section II indicates a need to focus on increasing learning gains in ELA. Progress monitoring from the 2020-2021 school year alludes to limited learning gains from the fall to spring monitoring assessments. Sixth grade increased proficiency levels of 43.9% in the Fall and a less than 3% increase by the Spring assessment. Seventh and eighth grade had larger increases in proficiency rates but still lacked significant growth in proficiency. Based on progress monitoring data the projected ELA achievement rate would have fallen below the previously tested year. It stands to reason that learning gains have followed a similar pattern. Further, data from 2018 and 2019 indicate decreases in learning gains among multiracial, Hispanic, and ELL subgroups. All three groups have increased in number from the 2018-2019 school year to the current year.

Measurable Outcome: ELA learning gains from 57% to 67% as measured by FSA exams.

Monitoring: Learning gains will be monitored through Collaborative Team Time (CTT) Reflection documents, CTT observations, iReady progress reports, district exemplar results, and teacher designed formative assessments. Additionally, members of the pedagogical leadership team will undertake quarterly reviews of the data gathered and analyzed during the above monitoring sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady will be used to both monitor growth and provide differentiated support. Additionally, intervention and enrichment plans will be created based on formative and summative assessment results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Assessment data will help to identify students struggling to make learning gains as related to standards and curriculum goals. Differentiation provided by both iReady and school-based intervention will increase support for struggling students.

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS interventions for at risk students
Person Responsible Alaina Beecroft (alainarb@leeschools.net)

Quarterly review of exemplar data for mathematics
Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Quarterly review of iReady data for mathematics
Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Parent and family communication
Person Responsible Tiffany Sanders (tiffanymys@leeschools.net)

Classroom rewards, celebrations, and incentives.

Person Responsible Tiffany Sanders (tiffanym@leeschools.net)

Monitoring of System44 and Read180 diagnostic data to support student growth.

Person Responsible Tiffany Sanders (tiffanym@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Acceleration points. School grade components aligned to Envision 2030. Currently, acceleration points are provided by passing scores on the Algebra and Geometry End of Course exams. This area of focus will aim to maintain the passage rate of students currently enrolled in Algebra and Geometry courses, as well as the proficiency of students in 6th grade which will result in an increase in the number of students on the Algebra and Geometry tracks according to the district’s math progression plan. This allows for greater opportunity to earn acceleration points in the future.

Measurable Outcome: Algebra I proficiency scores increase from 93% to 100% as measured on the Algebra EOC. Proficiency in 6th grade math scores will increase from 48% to 55%.

Monitoring: Proficiency levels will be monitored through Collaborative Team Time (CTT) Reflection documents, CTT observations, district exemplar results, and teacher designed formative assessments. Additionally, members of the pedagogical leadership team will undertake quarterly reviews of the data gathered and analyzed during the above monitoring sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Intervention and enrichment plans will be created based on formative and summative assessment results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Assessment data will help to identify students struggling to achieve proficiency as related to standards and curriculum goals. Timely interventions planned during CTT will help ensure students are not lacking skills and conceptual understanding required to maintain pace with the curriculum and class. Differentiation provided by school-based intervention will increase support for struggling students.

Action Steps to Implement

Data review in biweekly Collaborative Team Time (CTT) as evidenced on the CTT reflection documents.

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

Data driven interventions for students below proficiency of identified standards.

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

School to parent communication.

Person Responsible Tiffany Sanders (tiffanym@leeschools.net)

Classroom rewards, celebrations, and incentives.

Person Responsible Tiffany Sanders (tiffanym@leeschools.net)

Closely monitor SWD population and increase/modify supports as indicated by data.

Person Responsible Kristin Bueno (kristintb@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.

The primary area of concern for discipline is violent incidents. Lexington has a high rating for violent incidents for the 2019-2020 school year. While the data shows Lexington is ranked 13 out of the 18 Lee County middle schools, the impact of violent acts on school culture and environment is significant. Peer interactions, conflict resolution, and community building will be monitored by the PBIS coordinator, school counselors, and administrators. Incident data will be monitored by the administrative team.

The secondary area of concern is drug/public order incidents. Again, Lexington is ranked low by comparison to other Lee County middle schools, but maintains a high rating on SafeSchoolsforAlex.org. Similar to violent incidents, drug and tobacco infractions have a significantly detrimental effect on the school environment. Data will be monitored by the administrative team.

Data in both areas of concern will be monitored through FOCUS reports. ODR and minor infraction referrals will be sorted, monitored, and patterns identified. These patterns will be analysed by the administrative team in collaboration with the PBIS/MTSS and IB coordinators.

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.

Lexington is currently in the third year of implementation as a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school. Through PBIS, students, staff, parents, and the community are brought together to identify and celebrate successes which ultimately leads to a supportive, fulfilling learning environment for all students. Students are explicitly taught the importance of adherence to the high expectations set by faculty and staff members and are reminded often that their positive actions are noticed, appreciated, and contribute to the wellness of the school's culture.

Additionally, as the School District of Lee County works towards 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, Lexington has implemented protected Collaborative Team Time (CTT) and accompanying guiding documents to lead teachers through the careful analysis of student achievement data so that informed decisions can be made with regard to instructional practices. In Marzano's High Reliability levels, 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 CTT 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 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.

Kristin Bueno, Principal, facilitates the learning of all students by leading faculty and staff.

Tiffany Sanders, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, facilitates the onboarding of new faculty and staff members.

Tony Allen, Assistant Principal for Discipline, facilitates the inclusion of restorative practices and identification of students in need of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.

James Kroll, International Baccalaureate Coordinator and Instructional Coach, facilitates collaborative team sessions, models data-driven decision making, acts as liaison between the school and community via the school website and other media outlets.

Alaina Beecroft, Intervention Support Specialist and PBIS Coach, facilitates and monitors the implementation of PBIS practices schoolwide, serves as the Problem Solving Team Chair to aid in determining if behavior supports are necessary and effective when implemented for individual students.

Ben Andersen, Teacher, serves as the School Advisory Committee chairperson to obtain input from parents and community members.

Faculty and Staff implement and practice the outlined PBIS practices with students to educate, support, and celebrate students who contribute to the school's positive culture.

Student leaders and those who participate in clubs and extracurricular activities also contribute to PBIS practices, in particular aspects of celebrations and acknowledgements.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00

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