

The School District of Lee County

North Fort Myers Academy For The Arts



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

North Fort Myers Academy For The Arts

1856 ARTS WAY, North Fort Myers, FL 33917

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrew Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

North Fort Myers Academy For The Arts

1856 ARTS WAY, North Fort Myers, FL 33917

<http://nfa.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)
Combination School PK-8	No	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Academics and Arts for lifelong learning in a safe and caring environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a world class academic and arts 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
Gunns, Andrea	Principal	
Marks, Joy	Assistant Principal	
Turbeville, Missy	Assistant Principal	
Molhem, Kimberley	Assistant Principal	
Blauet, Brian	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Paul	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Deanna	Teacher, ESE	
Michael, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Howerton, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Ribas, Jessica	Other	3-5 Literacy Coach, Academic and Behavior Interventions for K-8, Elementary Test Coordinator, Safety team
Levine, David	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Bambrey, Shawn	Teacher, K-12	
Staley, Courtney	Reading Coach	Secondary Literacy Coach, Elementary Assistant Testing Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Andrew Miller

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.*

3

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,114

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

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

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	89	85	87	97	98	105	182	175	196	0	0	0	0	1114	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	27	16	13	22	15	42	19	36	0	0	0	0	195	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	12	7	12	0	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	2	19	14	7	6	7	18	29	19	0	0	0	0	121	
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	6	3	11	27	10	23	0	0	0	0	84	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	19	27	31	47	0	0	0	0	139	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	23	37	50	44	0	0	0	0	170	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	12	8	7	12	19	41	46	52	0	0	0	0	199	

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	3	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	17	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	7	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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				63%	62%	61%	64%	55%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	60%	59%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	53%	54%	43%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				67%	62%	62%	68%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains				62%	61%	59%	59%	55%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	49%	52%	43%	52%	52%
Science Achievement				52%	54%	56%	61%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				78%	78%	78%	71%	75%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019	72%	58%	14%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	55%	13%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
06	2021					
	2019	54%	52%	2%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
07	2021					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	60%	57%	3%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	79%	61%	18%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	62%	13%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	58%	17%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
06	2021					
	2019	21%	47%	-26%	55%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
07	2021					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
08	2021					
	2019	69%	60%	9%	46%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	50%	5%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	47%	46%	1%	48%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	92%	59%	33%	61%	31%
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 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/18.2	32/39	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2	4/36.4	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	All Students	0/0	21/26.3	3/100
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/33.3	1/100
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18/24	31/37.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/9.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/5.3	16/19.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	1/9.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/16.7	0/0	0/0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25/40.3	36/54.5	43/65.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/16.7	3/23.1	4/33.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/16.1	24/35.8	31/46.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/16.7	3/23.1	3/23.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/25

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49/50.5	60/58.8	63/61.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/25	5/27.8	5/27.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/33.3	1/33.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/13.5	35/34.7	51/50
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/13.3	4/23.5	4/22.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/33.3
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33/38.4	43/46.2	53/55.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	5/50	5/45.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/15.7	23/24.5	30/32.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/33	46/49.5	61/67
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/33.3	3/33.3	5/55.6
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75/51	76/49.4	88/55
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	6/25	7/26.9	7/26.9
	English Language Learners	1/14.3	0/0	2/20
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/31.1	56/37.6	74/48.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/16	7/29.2	8/33.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/61	91/60.7	103/69.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/30	1/7.7	2/16.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/33.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42/39.6	60/47.2	70/53
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/9.5	3/14.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/16.7	1/12.5
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67/67.7	103/70.1	119/77.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	7/38.9	8/40
	English Language Learners	1/25	3/50	4/50

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	99*62.3	117/63.9	132/70.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/10.5	2/8.3	3/13
	English Language Learners	2/25	4/44.4	3/33.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57/53.3	63/50.4	72/57.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/16.7
	English Language Learners	1/20	2/40	2/40
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43/30.3	61/39.1	79/49.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/11.1	2/9.1	3/16.7
	English Language Learners	2/25	1/11.1	1/11.1

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	18	37	39	20	20	22	25	8			
ELL	42	48	38	18	23	27					
BLK	37	45	30	33	41		33	45			
HSP	54	48	37	46	31	27	41	57	75		
MUL	69	71		64	43						
WHT	59	50	33	58	38	36	51	76	75		
FRL	45	43	37	37	25	21	36	48	52		
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	22	31	22	35	47	39	28	36			
ELL	37	45	42	46	58	50	27				
BLK	62	62	38	51	49	38	40				

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	61	50	36	65	61	51	46	85	38		
MUL	45	43		52	50		33				
WHT	65	55	30	71	64	41	60	76	65		
FRL	53	48	32	59	56	40	43	74	44		
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	27	35	39	34	42	31	26	52			
ELL	39	52	57	52	58	54	40				
BLK	55	49	40	57	50	20					
HSP	63	51	52	66	58	52	52	71	79		
MUL	50	44		57	53	23	55	64			
WHT	66	51	38	70	61	42	68	71	79		
FRL	58	47	43	63	56	46	58	66	79		

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	50
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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

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	38
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	46
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	62
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	53
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	39
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?

Data analysis of trends shows a decline in areas of achievement and learning gains across the board. Various subgroups had multi-year gaps. Our MTSS process needs re-organization to help best support all students as interventions were not implemented with fidelity and therefore the coresponding data reflects poorly in both performance and frequency.

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

The data components reflect that 29% of K-5 students were in yellow or red on reading progress monitoring assessments indicating that they were below level. 49% were in yellow or red on math progress monitoring assessments, however the state data does not reflect the same deficiency for math. Overall, the data shows that the greatest need for improvements are as follows:

Elementary Reading: Vocabulary

Middle School Reading: Comprehension in Informational Text for 6th and 7th grades, Vocabulary and Comprehension in Informational Text for 8th grade

Elementary Math- Numbers and Operations for K-3, Geometry in 4-5

Middle School Math- Algebra and Geometry

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement include the challenges faced unique to the pandemic situation, having multiple learning modalities, and challenges with attendance which were exasperated due to quarantines and illness.

New actions that we can and have already began to implement that will address the need for improvement include being able to offer in person learning to all students again and limiting the quarantine interruptions due to a change in procedures. We will continue to offer standards based instruction with fidelity, participate in Professional Learning Communities to address student need, and offer interventions as necessary through data monitoring. Additionally, we have offered summer school opportunities for continued learning and the district offers the "Connect with Lee" program for those who are absent or a student whom needs help to access a teacher's expertise during the day or afterschool to assist with homework.

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

Based off of the data collected, we did have a decline in most areas, but the area of most improvement was High Frequency Word knowledge. This area showed the most growth based on progress monitoring data comparing the 19/20 school year to 20/21.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement include the introduction of the I-Ready program to our campus which offers individualized learning opportunities unique to student's needs in both Reading and Math. Additionally, other digital resources (i.e. Nearpod, Zoom) were introduced to help student engagement despite the challenges faced with the pandemic.

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

Necessary strategies to accelerate learning will include the use of professional learning communities (PLCs) and data chats. Additionally, our Intervention Specialist, along with other leadership team members and classroom teachers will monitor student data and identify students who need remediation. The team will support teachers in intervention support. Professional development and training

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.

Professional development opportunities are being offered to all grade levels on a variety of curriculum and programs through the district. Leading and Learning meetings are held each month to deliver pertinent information to school leaders to take back to their teams through PLCs. Additionally, coaching cycles are offered to teachers to maximize learning in their classroom, as well as the ability to observe other classrooms and teachers for modeling opportunities.

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

Services being implemented to ensure sustainability include the use of individualized learning paths for students, data chats with all grade levels and departments, professional learning communities to analyze data and develop response to need, professional development opportunities for programs and curriculum in use- especially to new teachers, remedial classes and structured intervention time, and consistent student data monitoring.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

The ELA area of focus was identified as a need because the school dropped 7% in achievement, 1% in learning gains, and 7% of learning gains in the lowest 25%.

Measurable Outcome:

K-8 student achievement in ELA will increase 5% from 57% in 2020-2021 to 62% as measured by the ELA Florida Statewide Assessment administered in the Spring of 2022.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored through professional learning communities, the use of common assessments, data chats amongst grade levels and departments, I-Ready progress, and additional progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategies to assist with this area of focus include the usage of professional learning communities to analyze data and compare the outcomes of common assessments. The data from these sessions will be used to drive instruction and offer opportunities to create remediation/intervention and enrichment as needed. By using data driven instruction, student achievement levels will increase. Additionally, programs such as I-Ready, Read 180, and System 44 will be used.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to the International Reading Association (2012), time must also be provided for teams of teachers to study student achievement data to help plan for, design, and evaluate effective lessons, based on these data analysis.

“Effective use of data is key to improving student outcomes. This requires leaders to ensure teachers have developed the skills to convert student data to useful information to effectively plan for instruction and student interventions; to hold collaborative discussions that are structured for these purposes; to broaden the view of data to include student papers, products and performances; and to broaden the view of assessment to include assessment-on-the-fly. Thus, they empower teachers to climb fully into the “driver’s seat” in the multi-faceted undertaking of using data to drive instruction.” (Willhelm, 2011, Educational Leadership)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify baseline student achievement levels

Person Responsible

Courtney Staley (courtneyst@leeschools.net)

2. Align evidence based strategies with student needs

Person Responsible

Laura Sherman (laurajsh@leeschools.net)

3. Support PLC teams- Team leads, Admin team, Coaches, Intervention Specialist.

Person Responsible

Courtney Staley (courtneyst@leeschools.net)

4. Monitor student data throughout the school year through progress monitoring- Classroom teachers, Intervention Specialist, Coaches, Admin team

Person Responsible Courtney Staley (courtneyst@leeschools.net)

5.Offer remediation as needed - Intervention Specialist, Classroom teachers, Support staff

Person Responsible Courtney Staley (courtneyst@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math data showed a drop in 15% for achievement, 25% in learning gains, and an 11% drop in learning gains for the lowest 25% from the previous data set.
Measurable Outcome:	K-8 Student achievement will increase 5% from 53% in 2020-21 to 58% as measured by the ELA Florida Statewide Assessment.
Monitoring:	Outcomes will be monitored by determining progress through PLCs, common assessments, data chats with grade levels and math teams, I-Ready data monitoring, Reflex math monitoring, and progress monitoring assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The evidence- based strategies to assist with this area of focus include the usage of professional learning communities to analyze data and compare the outcomes of common assessments. The data from these sessions will be used to drive instruction and offer opportunities to create remediation/intervention and enrichment as needed. By using data driven instruction, student achievement levels will increase.</p> <p>Additionally, students in elementary grades can use Reflex math and other foundational math programs as a means of building these foundational math facts which will contribute to success in other mathematical functions.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Reflex math is a means of building foundational math facts which will contribute to success in other mathematical functions.</p> <p>Duncan et al. (2007) showed that early math skills are one of the best predictors of later success in both math and literacy, which is why it is pertinent for early childhood educators to increase math instruction in preschool through 3rd grade.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Math is a subject that builds on itself starting in early childhood. A student who fails a sixth-grade math course has a 60% chance of dropping out prior to high school graduation (Ribner, Willoughby, Blair, & Family Life Project Key Investigators, 2017)

Person Responsible [no one identified]

2. Align evidence based strategies with student needs.

Person Responsible Jessica Ribas (jessicalr@leeschools.net)

3.Support PLC teams.

Person Responsible Jessica Ribas (jessicalr@leeschools.net)

4. Monitor student data throughout the school year through progress .

Person Responsible Jessica Ribas (jessicalr@leeschools.net)

5.Offer remediation as needed.

**Person
Responsible** Jessica Ribas (jessicalr@leeschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Acceleration Points**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: The Acceleration Point achievement dropped 6% overall.

Measurable Outcome: Middle School achievement in tested courses with EOC industry certifications will increase 6% from 74% to 80%.

Monitoring: Progress towards the desired outcome will be monitored through the PLCs and data analysis. Classroom teachers of these courses will continuously monitor data through the use of progress monitoring and formative assessments. Student placement will be monitored to ensure accuracy and success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Data analysis will be completed through constant assessment monitoring through official progress monitoring and formative assessment data collection. Professional learning committees can then ensure differentiated and high-yield strategies to use. The introduction of the Cambridge Global program can contribute to student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A part of implementing effective instruction is assessing what students know, both in a formative and summative manner. A complete assessment system should include classroom-level tests for formative assessment purposes that are aligned with state-level standardized assessments used for summative evaluation (Wang et al., 2006). Erskine (2014) explained how although summative assessments may highlight areas students need improvement in, it does not help explain why, like formative assessments do. Formative assessments, which include teachers' daily observations based on assignments, which is followed by specific and descriptive feedback, helps determine future instruction and learning.

Wiggins and McTighe (2005) explained how assessments should occur as a part of instruction, using a variety of formats. Local and state formative assessments for learning and summative assessments of learning must be a part of a comprehensive assessment system and view of student performance (Smith, Smith, and De Lisi, 2001; Wang et al., 2006).

Action Steps to Implement

Place any students that scored a level 3 or above in the appropriate course.

Person Responsible Joy Marks (joyrm@leeschools.net)

Monitor baseline data to determine student supports needed.

Person Responsible Joy Marks (joyrm@leeschools.net)

Monitor student data throughout the school year through progress monitoring through STAR.

Person Responsible Joy Marks (joyrm@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 SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, our school has a total of 2.1 incidents per 100 students compared to 1.6 incidents per 100 for the state as a whole.

The breakdown is as follows:

Violent- 1.25 per 100 school/ 1.13 per 100 state

Property- 0.18 per 100 school/ 0.03 per 100 state

Drug/Public Order- 0.63 per 100 school/ 0.4 per 100 state

Our main concern for improvement is to decrease the violent incidents in our school though we are absolutely concerned with lowering all aspects of discipline including the drug and property incidents.

Our school will continue to monitor our discipline data incidence numbers as we adjust protocols to help increase school culture to look for improvement. We have introduced heavily the use of restorative practices, zones of regulation, and other culture building techniques to create a lasting effect on student incidences.

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 addresses building a positive school culture through the use of a school wide PBIS program, the Zones of Regulation, Restorative practices, and a school safety team. The school safety team includes the School Resource Officer, Administration, the Behavior Specialist, and other key staff members.

PBIS is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. The goal is to create an environment where all students succeed.

Meanwhile, Restorative Practices aim to reduce crime, violence, and bullying while improving human behavior and strengthening civil society. This is accomplished by building the "5 Rs" of relationships, respect, responsibility, repair, and reintegration.

Additionally, we use the Zones of Regulation which is a systematic and cognitive-behavioral approach to

help teach our students ways to regulate their feelings, energy, and sensory reactions to meet the demands of the environment around them.

Each of these things work in unison to help build a positive culture and environment for all.

Lastly, a clear code of conduct for students and staff with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created to ensure understanding and uniformity of expectations and procedures.

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

Our stakeholders and the roles they play in promoting a positive culture and environment include:

The Safety Team - monitors discipline referrals or incident reports, in and out-of-school suspension, and attendance concerns. Discusses what is effective/ineffective for particular groups within a school and what adjustments should occur. Establishes strategies for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implements evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches.

School Resource Officer- Ensures a safe learning environment for the students and staff

Behavioral Specialist- Supports the staff members who work to keep the learning environment safe, observes students for possible behavior interventions necessary to be successful.

PTO- Promotes teacher appreciation, maintains consistent contact with the school to determine needs for support, fundraiser to support school goals.

SAC- Helps act as a liaison for the community by bringing the district, business partners, and teacher/parents together. Also, helps to gather and provide information to the principal and the DAC on the needs and concerns of the community.

The Arts Foundation- Helps with fundraising for the arts program which is unique to our school.

Action Teams- A variety of problem solving teams comprised of all staff members with a sole purpose of adding to the success of our school

Administrators/Leadership - The administration ensures that teachers are supported through the proper resources and trainings. Administrators provide constructive feedback and assistance to all staff. They also act as a liaison between teachers and parents during larger student concerns. Solicit feedback on procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. Structure schedules to allow for collaborative planning to assist with data driven instruction.

Teachers- meet in weekly PLCs to routinely examine data and identify trends to guide instruction, adjust instruction to meet the individual needs of the learner, invest time into lesson development that accommodates for all learners

Parents- Helps to ensure students are engaged and challenged in their educational environment, as well as supporting their learning along the way. Works in partnership for the benefit of their child's education.

District Staff- Responsible for providing instructional leadership and developing, implementing, and evaluating district and school systems and policies.

Board Members- Responsible for finances, assessment, special education, and the like in unison with District personnel.

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: Other: Acceleration Points	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00