

The School District of Lee County

North Fort Myers High 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

North Fort Myers High School

5000 ORANGE GROVE BLVD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

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

Demographics

Principal: Debbie Diggs

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	77%
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 (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

North Fort Myers High School

5000 ORANGE GROVE BLVD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">53%</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="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">39%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

North Fort Myers High School's mission is to guide students in a purposeful and challenging direction and to inspire mastery of skills for lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

North Fort Myers High School's vision is to prepare every student for success.

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
Diggs, Debbie	Principal	
Amaya, Ronda	Assistant Principal	
Conn, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Hutchinson, Samantha	Assistant Principal	
McKeever, Douglas	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Debbie Diggs

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

94

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,828

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

14

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	0	0	0	0	466	440	478	444	1828
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	46	48	56	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	13	17	13	58
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	52	39	17	109
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	35	70	125
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	49	45	57	206
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	84	83	36	266
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	71	65	74	259

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	8

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	420	465	438	464	1787
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	21	21	26	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	17	20	75
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	35	33	103
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	40	40	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	35	35	29	139
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	50	60	169

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	28	35	52	49	164

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	1	0	0	1	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	5

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	420	465	438	464	1787
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	21	21	26	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	17	20	75
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	35	33	103
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	40	40	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	35	35	29	139
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	50	60	169

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	28	35	52	49	164

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	1	0	0	1	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	5

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				76%	55%	56%	75%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	49%	51%	63%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	37%	42%	51%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				61%	50%	51%	59%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				49%	45%	48%	45%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	43%	45%	37%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				80%	62%	68%	82%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				79%	67%	73%	64%	66%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	76%	51%	25%	55%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	75%	48%	27%	53%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	56%	23%	67%	12%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	64%	13%	70%	7%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	41%	59%	-18%	61%	-20%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	67%	50%	17%	57%	10%

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 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	270/68	275/67/6	264/65.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	4/16.7	5/21.7	3/12
	English Language Learners	1/10	2/20	1/10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	237/60.5	260/64.2	245/62.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/9.1	5/20.8	4/17.4
	English Language Learners	2/20	3/30	3/30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	139/64.1	270/90	201/90.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1/100	1/33.3	1/33.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	292/68.9	297/68.3	298/69.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7/25	5/18.5	9/31
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/42.9	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33/24.1	38/26.4	40/27.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/9.1	6/26.1	4/17.4
	English Language Learners	2/50	3/50	2/33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	23/34.3	47/59.5	39/57.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	4/26.7	9/45	7/41.2
	English Language Learners	2/50	3/60	1/33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	1/100	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	204/75.6	239/81.3	226/80.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	5/31.3	9/52.9	7/41.2
	English Language Learners	1/33.3	1/25	1/25

Grade 12					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners		N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners		N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		0/0	0/0	1/100
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		2/100	2/100	3/100
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	29	29	29	26	26	25	42	32		100	71
ELL	47	65	71	53	31	40				92	92
ASN	87	64		85						100	100
BLK	53	50	38	33	14	19	67	55		100	95
HSP	74	65	50	54	30	36	81	74		97	95

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
MUL	71	52		64	29		80	64			
WHT	74	58	48	64	33	40	79	77		100	96
FRL	59	51	41	43	30	35	65	68		99	94
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	28	35	27	22	42	39	35	46		98	23
ELL	48	52	27	47	56		75				
ASN	89	72		82	73					92	92
BLK	63	51	27	48	52	30	55	53		94	40
HSP	72	64	45	52	41	44	76	73		96	74
MUL	61	52	40	42	35		77			89	56
WHT	78	63	47	65	52	41	83	81		98	71
FRL	68	61	43	51	44	33	71	65		95	62
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	28	46	40	36	43	36	41	43		75	39
ELL		58			25						
ASN	89	72		54	45		82				
BLK	82	49	62	47	38		88	46		88	57
HSP	70	65	55	58	50	49	83	73		94	66
MUL	76	50		72	53		100	60			
WHT	75	63	48	59	43	30	81	64		93	68
FRL	68	59	49	50	42	34	76	58		89	58

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	735
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
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	52
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	67
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	60
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	67
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	59
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 overall trend in comparing 2019 and 2021 results is that even with all the challenges of the Pandemic, performance levels remained fairly stable. In most areas, North did not see much in the way of gains, however, we also did not experience significant drops. In looking at the current FY22 students, their baseline Progress Monitoring data came in slightly lower for ELA, Geometry and US, however, slightly higher for Algebra 1 and Bio. Our ESE subgroup has continued to perform below the 41% threshold.

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

Our biggest drops were for ELA gains and Math gain. US History Proficiency also saw a drop.

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 inconsistent face to face instruction during the last year and a half has certainly lead to decreased levels of engagement for students. Additionally, with the multiple instructional models and many students failing to participate in progress monitoring during the FY21 school year, it was more difficult to target specific areas for support.

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

We saw improvement in the ELA L25 gains.

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

Supports in place including common course PLCs, tracking of progress monitoring as it related to specific benchmarks, push in support from a certified ELA teacher for our ESE students, Intensive Reading course in addition to the ELA course.

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

Common course PLCs, tracking of progress monitoring as it related to specific benchmarks, push in support from a certified teacher for our ESE students in each of the core areas, Intensive reading courses in addition to the ELA course, and new this year is piloting Alg 1A/1B for our intensive math students and all freshmen in a Biology course.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

During preschool we held several training sessions related to student engagement, establishing and fostering relationships and data analysis. Throughout the year we are offering optional PD sessions related to high impact strategies and technology resources.

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

We have initiated a model to further develop teacher leaders to be able to support teachers in every department. Rather than having monthly department head meetings, we are using e-mail for business type items and instead using that time for a book study around high impact strategies. The teacher leaders, in turn, have become instructional leaders among their department and are providing PD during faculty PLCs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: This area was tied for our biggest data drop for ELA from FY19 to FY21

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA learning gains from 59% to 63% as measured by the ELA FSA by June 2022.

Monitoring: An administrator with certification in Reading will oversee the work of the ELA Common Course PLC. This will include attending PLC, assisting with the review of data, and providing resources as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The 9th and 10th Grade ELA and Intensive Reading classes will be tracking gains data through teaching tracking processes and student tracking processes. Teachers will use targeting vocabulary instruction, high-yield strategies, small group instruction and scaffolding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: High-yield strategies have been show to produce increases in student achievement, targeted vocabulary instruction improves comprehension, scaffolding provides support for students to enhance learning and aids in the mastery of tasks, and small group instruction provides opportunity to differentiate instruction to support individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer progress monitoring and exemplar benchmark assessments
2. Analyze data to guide instruction
3. Incorporate evidence based strategies to target deficiencies
4. Re-assess after instruction

Person Responsible Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: This area was tied for our biggest data drop for math from FY19 to FY21

Measurable Outcome: Increase math learning gains from 32% to 41% as measured by the Math FSA EOCs by June 2022.

Monitoring: An administrator with certification in Math will oversee the work of the Alg 1 and Geometry Common Course PLCs. This will include attending PLC, assisting with the review of data, and providing resources as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Alg 1 and Geometry classes will be tracking gains data through teaching tracking processes and student tracking processes. Instructional strategies to support ESE and ELL students are scaffolding, Activating background knowledge, peer tutoring and graphic organizers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring and exemplar assessments personalize learning and align student instruction with standard they struggle with by using differentiated instruction. Graphic organizers make it easier to organize thought and encourage students to make decisions in their own learning. Peer tutoring allows students to increase their own understanding of material and assists in the mastery of skills through re-teaching.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer progress monitoring and exemplar benchmark assessments
2. Identify essential EOC standards where students are deficient, based on formative data
3. Increase practice time on test specifications and problem structures
4. Differentiate practice

Person Responsible: Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@leeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: ESE subgroup was identified as a subgroup performing below the 41% minimum threshold.

Measurable Outcome: Students with disabilities identified on the Federal ESSE Index will improve performance in tested areas from 40% to 43% as measured by the FSA and FSAA by June 2022.

Monitoring: An administrator who oversees ESE will monitor and provide supports. This will include attending PLCs, assisting with the review of data, and providing resources as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Scaffolding tasks, skill/task modeling and explicit vocabulary instruction through SAID strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research show that building on students' prior knowledge and experiences as they are learning new skills supports ESE students and enhances learning. Scaffolding is a strategy to provide this support. Modeling provides an opportunity for students to self-regulate learning and for teachers/students to share their thinking through tasks/skills. Additionally, students with learning disabilities benefit from explicit vocabulary instruction, repeated exposure to new words, and opportunities to use new words in classroom activities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Scaffolding tasks through questioning techniques to activate prior knowledge and experience.
2. Teachers and students to model reading and thinking to provide examples of review material for critical vocabulary (both content and non-content, ex. addition, describe)

VOCABULARY

1. SAID strategy (synonyms, antonyms, inference information, definition)
2. Pre-teach vocab/activities
3. Incorporate words in context within lesson and language rich environment
4. Include vocabulary in formative and summative assessments

Person Responsible Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Regular school attendance has a positive impact on student achievement. Eleven percent of our current population has a history of being chronically absent (missing 10% or more of the days)

Measurable Outcome: Decrease the number of chronically absent students by 10% from 209 to 188 students as measured by FOCUS Attendance Report by June 2022.

Monitoring: AP who oversees attendance and the School Social worker will meet weekly to analyze absentee data. Root causes of absences will be identified and student specific strategies implemented to increase attendance. Focus will also be on early intervention with students in the 6%-9% range.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: -weekly monitoring of attendance
 -focus of early intervention with students in the 6%-9% range
 -implementation of individual strategies targeted to remove/reduce the root cause

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that monitoring and early intervention are effective strategies to decrease the number of chronically absent students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor absences Weekly
2. Identify students that fall between the 6%-9% range and students 10% or higher.
3. Attendance AP, Social Worker, and School Counselors will meet with students and contact parents to identify root causes of students' absences for the students falling in the 6%-9% range as well as 10%+ range.

Person Responsible Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Learning and performance is negatively impacted by students who miss classroom instructional time due to inappropriate behavior.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of Out-of-School-Suspension consequences by 10% from 58 to 52 as measured by FOCUS Discipline Report by June 2022.
Monitoring:	AP who oversees discipline will regularly analyze OSS data, record on school data board and update Principal at weekly meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Douglas McKeever (douglasim@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As an alternative to OSS where inappropriate, two teachers will facilitate teaching and learning while students are in the Center for Corrective Action and also utilize their respective de-escalation techniques and skills to improve student inappropriate behavior. 2. Enact restorative practices as a means to alter and change student negative behavior to a positive mindset. Strategies to include mentoring, positive role models and positive reinforcement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research demonstrates that mentors, positive role models, and student recognition contribute to positive student outcomes, thus reducing inappropriate behaviors and aide in the teaching and learning process.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet weekly with CCA facilitators to monitor data of student inappropriate behavior.
 2. Meet weekly with the Principal to evaluate, plan and review student OSS progress.
 3. Provide individual strategies for students with continuous behavior management concerns.
- Person Responsible** Douglas McKeever (douglasim@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

NFMHS is in the low category for incidents. The site is reporting 91 suspensions in FY20 (45 ISS and 46 OSS...2nd lowest in the district) and has been on a regular decline since FY17. Threat/intimidation and Tobacco were the higher ranking areas (although still lower than the state or district average). We will continue monitoring data for any changes and continue focusing on building student relationships to decrease student instances of misbehavior.

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.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00