Fort Myers Middle Academy

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fort Myers Middle Academy

3050 CENTRAL AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33901

http://fmm.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Brian Gibson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2017

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: D (36%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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

Fort Myers Middle Academy

3050 CENTRAL AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33901

http://fmm.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a quality learning environment that prepares our students for success in high school, post-secondary education, and future careers. This mission will be accomplished through high expectations, relevant and engaging learning experiences, multiple opportunities to learn, and parental and community involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision, at FMMA, is to ensure each child has the proper foundation towards college and career readiness.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Edward, Lynn	Principal	Mrs. Edward oversees operations schoolwide. In this role, Mrs. Edwards ensures the smooth day-to-day operations of the institution. This role encompasses building positive relationships with students, parents, teachers, staff and community partners. Mrs. Edward works with the leadership team that encompases, assistant principals, grade-level chairs, department heads, discipline deans, and instructional coaches to develop plans for the continuous growth of the institution.
Fitzpatrick, Denise	Assistant Principal	Dr. Fitzpatrick is the associate principal at Fort Myers Middle Academy. Dr. Fitzpatrick oversees scheduling and curriculum. In this role, Dr. Fitzpatrick supports teaching and learning in a number ways, namely ensuring that students are properly scheduled into their classes that support their learning level. Dr. Fitzpatrick works with parents, students, and teachers to resolve any conflicts that arise in a students academic progress. As part of the leadership team Dr. Fitzpatrick works with building stakeholders to find fair and equitable solutions to the issues that arise throughout the day.
	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach/ Math PCT/ Math Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/16/2017, Brian Gibson

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

692

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

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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	256	205	210	0	0	0	0	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	44	64	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	36	38	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	4	8	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	6	13	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	83	83	0	0	0	0	261
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	102	83	0	0	0	0	291
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	94	94	0	0	0	0	308

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

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	256	205	210	0	0	0	0	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	44	64	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	36	38	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	4	8	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	6	13	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	83	83	0	0	0	0	261
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	102	83	0	0	0	0	291
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	94	94	0	0	0	0	308

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	27%	48%	50%				33%	55%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	36%						44%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						37%	44%	47%
Math Achievement	20%	32%	36%				44%	64%	58%
Math Learning Gains	32%						51%	64%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						43%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	24%	51%	53%				28%	50%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	40%	53%	58%				59%	70%	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	2022					
	2019	27%	52%	-25%	54%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	26%	51%	-25%	52%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
08	2022					
	2019	35%	57%	-22%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	43%	47%	-4%	55%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	31%	57%	-26%	54%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2022					
	2019	26%	60%	-34%	46%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	26%	46%	-20%	48%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	49%	67%	-18%	71%	-22%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	59%	36%	61%	34%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	11	27	25	9	36	45	24	31			
ELL	15	32	26	12	29	37	6	31			
BLK	20	30	34	16	27	35	16	35	72		
HSP	31	44	33	21	35	40	24	39	80		
MUL	69			36							
WHT	41	50		39	50		47	75			
FRL	28	37	34	19	31	44	22	38	76		
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	14	26	31	13	11	3	23	37			
ELL	14	51	45	22	32	36	17	19			
BLK	19	28	27	17	15	18	24	30	42		

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
HSP	26	38	37	29	30	21	29	40	57		
MUL	57			14							
WHT	39	35		34	37		45	55			
FRL	22	30	30	21	20	18	25	35	43		
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	18	39	47	24	45	52	15	43			
ELL	21	32	21	45	49	38	8	48			
BLK	25	37	37	35	47	45	20	51	52		
HSP	39	47	29	53	55	31	28	67	65		
MUL	64			73							
WHT	57	67		63	61		52	71	80		
FRL	31	42	43	41	49	41	23	55	56		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

From 2021 to 2022, FMMA showed gains in reading proficiency, reading learning gains, reading learning gains L25, math learning gains, math learning gains for L25, civics proficiency, and acceleration. While these gains were made, our proficiency scores in all areas are below state and district averages. Our 6th-grade math scores for all students dropped significantly from 2021 to 2022. Subgroup data indicates that students with disabilities and our ELL population score below other subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on 2022 state assessments our greatest need for improvement consist of reading and math proficiency and gains. Based on subgroup data, our students with disabilities and ELL students need additional support.

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

Fort Myers Middle Academy lost teachers last year in math and ELA. The school has also had difficulty recruiting teachers for open vacancies. Sign-on and recruiting bonuses would assist the school in finding teachers for vacancies In regard to math and reading, a significant number of 6th-grade students enter middle school significantly below grade level. Actions that need to be taken include training teachers on the new B.E.S.T Florida Standards. PLCs will need to meet weekly to plan for instruction including unpacking standards, determining how the standard will be taught, assessing students on the new standards, and using data to determine reteaching and enrichment needs. Small group targeted interventions need to happen for both reading and math. The intervention Specialist will work with tier 3 students in math, reading, and behavior.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our greatest improvement was in Algebra/acceleration with a 27 percentage point gain. Civics also had a growth of 3 percentage points. Math L25 grew 20 percentage points. Proficiency and gains also seen in reading were also seen.

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

FMMA had our PCT teaching algebra last year. She incorporated small group instruction and
The Social Studies coach and writing coach instructed the course until a full-time teacher could be hired.
The math coach worked with small groups of students on math skills.

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

Fort Myers Middle Academy will renew their implementation of Marzano High Reliability Schools and the Solution Tree Professional Learning Communities structure. Using the PLC process teachers and coaches will analyze their progress monitoring data in order adjust instruction to better serve our students.

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.

Teachers will be offered opportunities to attend PLC training conferences to deepen their knowledge of the PLC process.

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

As the school strives over the next 2 years to achieve Level 1 and 2 High Reliability School status, we will continue to deepen our understanding of Marzano HRS strategies to better out implementation.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	1. All content area professional learning communities (PLCs) will meet weekly to plan for standards-based instruction. 2. Coaches will engage tier 3 teachers in coaching cycles and lesson planning. 3.Monitor student learning through PLCs to take action based on feedback, exemplars, and student work samples that are standards aligned. 4. Coaches will work with teachers to better utilize test item specifications and achievement descriptor levels to increase the rigor of student tasks for math and ELA proficiency. Student data indicates a need for an explicit systematic approach to instruction in light of the roll out of new standards in the area of mathematics and English Language Arts. Data indicates that students are significantly below state averages in mathematics and English Language Arts. Planning sessions did not have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By October 2022, 100% of teachers will be proficient at unpacking and creating standards aligned learning goals as measured by teacher submitted lesson plans. By January 2023, 100% of teachers will be able to follow the PLC process, unpack standards and design standards aligned lessons as measured through PLC minutes By April 2023, the number of tier 3 teachers engaged in the coaching cycle will decrease by 50% as measured by walkthrough data and evaluations. 100% of teachers will review student exemplar data quarterly in PLCs and adjust instruction as measured by PLC minutes and data folders.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	PLC notes and agendas, lesson plans, walkthroughs, coaching records, exemplars and progress monitoring
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	As teachers become accustomed to their new state standards FMMA will focus on strategies that help teachers design high quality standards aligned lessons. To aid in this process FMMA will focus on the PLC process by training teachers in PLCs. In order to deepen their understanding teachers will be sent off-site for additional training. Coaches will use PLCs to focus on guiding teachers through the process of unpacking standards. Coaches will engage tier 3 teachers in the coaching cycle.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	Due to staffing changes and the roll out of new state standards FMMA feels that PLCs have lost their focus. For this reason FMMA feels that a renewed effort toward a better understanding the PLC process will strengthen our instructional teams and student data. Renewing PLCs will focus teachers on unpacking standards and high-quality instruction, which will increase student learning. Administration has created

specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. system for tiering teachers, identifying tier 3 as teacher who need additional coaching support.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administration will develop expectations for lesson content and ensure that content areas have common planning.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Teachers will analyze relevant data and plan student supports

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Coaches will facilitate the planning process.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Administration will develop a plan for tiering teachers and implementing the coaching cycle for lower tiered teachers.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Administration will provide additional training in the PLC process.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Teachers will preview benchmarks and materials prior to coming to their PLCs.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Teachers will unpack standards and design lessons aligned to benchmarks.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Teachers will implement close reading lessons to support content area literacy.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Coaches will engage in the coaching cycle with tire 3 teachers.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Coaches will communicate expectations to teachers prior to planning sessions.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

Coaches will assist teachers with implementing close reading lessons to support content area literacy.

Person Responsible	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to -creating a safe and orderly campus	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Area of Focus: To create and implement processes and procedures for a safe and orderly environment. Administrative staff, teachers, parents, and students at Fort Myers Middle Academy responded to an online survey designed to gauge the school's status on eight leading indicators related to Marzano's High Reliability Schools framework. The survey addressed leading indicators for Level 1 Safe, Supportive, and Collaborative Culture. The matrix for the survey indicated that scores below a 3.5 mean were an area of concern. Results indicate both staff and students rated the indicator for a safe and orderly environment below the 3.5 mean. To begin to address this concern, a group of teachers met to identify school-wide processes and procedures to address a safe and orderly environment.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By August 2022, 100% of teachers will be trained on the school-wide processes and procedures. This will be measured using the attendance sign-in for pre-school training. By October 2022, coaches, department heads, and administrators will complete walkthrough observations assessing the practice of the new school-wide processes and procedures. Coaches and administration will use the informal observation tool created by the Processes and Procedures Summer PLC to assess teacher compliance. By December 2022, FMMA will achieve a mean rate of 3.5 for indicator 1.2 safe and orderly environment on the Marzano survey. By the end of second quarter staff and students will retake the Marzano HRS Survey to measure the improvement we have made towards our goal.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Coach, Department Head, and Administrative walkthroughs. Survey Data Teacher classroom processes and procedures document
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The school is seeking Level 1 - Safe, Supportive, and Collaborative Culture certification in Marzano's HIgh Reliability Schools framework. The process and procedures PLC met during the summer to review data from teachers and students to identify schoolwide procedures.
Rationale for Evidence-based	Results from our initial survey of stakeholders showed a need to focus on a safe and orderly environment. Additionally, with a high number of new teachers, there is a need to refocus on school-wide processes and procedures.

Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The administration provided an opportunity for the process and procedure PLC to meet during the summer.

| **Person Responsible** | Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net) |

The HRS guiding coalition will share survey results with teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Lynn Edward (lynnme@leeschools.net) |

Teachers will review HRS survey data.

| **Person Responsible** | Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net) |

The administration will participate in walkthrough process to gather data on implementation.

| **Person Responsible** | Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net) |

The administration will share walkthrough data with teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net) |

The HRS guiding coalition will gather lagging indicators for Level 1 certification.

| **Person Responsible** | Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net) |

The HRS guiding coalition will assess the quick data collected related to Level 1 indicators.

| **Person Responsible** | Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net) |

Teachers will plan classroom processes and procedures that align with the schoolwide processes and procedures.

| **Person Responsible** | Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net) |

Teachers will engage in collegial walkthroughs targeting schoolwide processes and procedures.

Person Responsible   Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@leeschools.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

FMMA is a Community Partnership School with the United Way. Through United Way the school is able to provide food and housing assistance to staff and students. The United Way also provides clothing assistance to families who need it. Periodically, students are allowed to use "Dolphin Dollars" earned from positive performance at school ot shop in the on campus United Way store. THe United Way provides "pop-up" shops for teachers.
In the classroom teachers award "Dolphin Dollars" to students for positive classroom actions. These dollars can be redeemed periodically for rewards. This year students will participate in planning the our celebrations. Once a month teachers will nominate students they feel are role models on our campus. By being role models those students will earn the right to be out of dree code.

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

United Way will provide their array of support for staff and students.
The PBIS Team will manage the rewards and celebrations for Dolphin Dollars.
The Celebrations Committee will get student input in order to develop more meaningful student rewards.
Grade-level teachers will nominate students monthly role model award.