Fort Myers High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Fort Myers High School

2635 CORTEZ BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33901

http://fmh.leeschools.net/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a safe, student-centered culture where each student achieves his/her highest potential through a tradition of excellence

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become the highest performing public high school in the State of Florida.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bernard, Misty	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assist the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school.
Heinzman-Britton, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assist the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school.
Cato, Steven	Other	Assist the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school. Oversee athletics and activities.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

A draft of the SIP is developed and then provided to the school leadership team and student government association representatives for review. The draft SIP is then revised to include their feedback. The School Advisory Council then reviews the SIP and offers input.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be developed prior to the start of the school year. After each progress monitoring period, current data will be reviewed and compared with goals. The school leadership team will evaluate the current interventions and adjust them as needed based on the current data. School administration will monitor the implementation of these interventions.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	304
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	332
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1386

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	47	50	69	49	51	65		
ELA Learning Gains				62			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			42		
Math Achievement*	45	34	38	49	33	38	44		
Math Learning Gains				48			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			30		
Science Achievement*	73	54	64	68	35	40	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	73	58	66	72	40	48	84		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	96	84	89	98	49	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	78	65	65	78	60	67	70		
ELP Progress	77	36	45	57			49		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	691
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	98

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	2	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	49			
HSP	66			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	45			
HSP	62			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			45			73	73		96	78	77
SWD	32			13			43	25		29	6	
ELL	28			24			57	46		63	7	77
AMI												
ASN	88			81			89	90		89	6	
BLK	35			19			45	47		53	6	
HSP	54			41			70	66		69	6	
MUL	54			52			83			80	5	
PAC												
WHT	72			62			84	88		86	6	
FRL	47			32			60	62		66	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	69	62	42	49	48	48	68	72		98	78	57
SWD	21	38	29	13	34	44	25	21		94	24	
ELL	40	49	38	28	47	48	40	36				57
AMI												
ASN	92	77		75	50		86	90		100	96	
BLK	35	44	35	22	43	42	42	40		100	49	40
HSP	65	63	36	46	47	51	61	74		99	80	65
MUL	88	79		67	50		85	100		100	82	
PAC												
WHT	82	67	58	68	54	62	79	80		98	85	
FRL	51	53	34	33	45	48	50	55		98	64	64

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	59	42	44	31	30	67	84		98	70	49
SWD	13	32	33	18	29	26	16	53		94	24	
ELL	24	52	46	22	35	33	19	79		89	53	49
AMI												
ASN	86	83		75	71		92	95		100	95	
BLK	36	46	38	17	19	23	36	51		97	45	48
HSP	59	57	57	40	35	38	64	83		95	67	48
MUL	81	71		80	33		100	91		93	77	
PAC												
WHT	77	63	37	61	35	43	75	89		100	79	
FRL	47	50	41	26	23	28	50	72		98	55	44

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	62%	45%	17%	50%	12%
09	2023 - Spring	59%	46%	13%	48%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	39%	-18%	50%	-29%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	43%	14%	48%	9%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	50%	21%	63%	8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	54%	17%	63%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component which showed the lowest performance in 2022 was ELA lowest 25%. However, based on preliminary 22-23 data, the component which showed the lowest performance was Math Achievement. While students have entered high school with achievement scores lower than ever before, staffing issues are a contributing factor. In 21-22, there were vacancies in the Reading Department and in 22-23, one math teacher left public school and two more left education all together during the school year. The inability to fill classrooms with qualified educators has made it difficult to close learning gaps.

These gaps have been exacerbated by remote learning during COVID and loss of instructional time during hurricane Ian.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Social Studies achievement showed the greatest decline from 2021 to 2022. Based on preliminary data, social studies achievement showed a slight increase from 72% proficient to 73% proficient in 2023. Classroom observations and walkthroughs indicate a need for teacher coaching in this content area. Additionally, the Social Studies progression changed so now there are more tenth graders taking US History. When compared to eleventh graders, tenth graders have had less exposure to instruction in ELA, which may contribute to the drop in scores.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Mathematics. In 2022, only 48.5% of FMHS students scored proficient on the mathematics assessments compared with 53.1% state-wide. One contributing factor may be that higher performing students take Algebra 1 in eighth grade instead of in ninth grade.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

While the area which showed the greatest gap between school and state average was mathematics, this is also the area which showed the most improvement. We double blocked Algebra 1 for our lowest performing math students and scheduled a support facilitator who was also certified in math into the class each block. Having double the time as well as two knowledgeable teachers in the classroom for the full year may have contributed to this increase.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Potential areas of concern include student attendance and ELA achievement. Early warning data shows that 22% of students last year had below a 90% attendance rate. While hurricane Ian and its impact on our school community may have contributed to that, students cannot learn when they are not in school. Additionally, 25% of ninth and tenth graders scored a preliminary achievement level of 1 on the ELA assessment last year.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1 - ELA achievement
2 - Math achievement
3 - Graduation rate

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The ESSA subgroup relating to students with disabilities is an area of focus because the SWD subgroup performed below the Federal Index. In 2022, only 21% of students with disabilities scored proficient on the FSA ELA assessment, only 13% scored proficient on the math assessment, 25% on science, and 21% on social studies. Closing learning gaps and increasing students' ELA skills will permeate through all other content areas and is critical for high school graduation. If students can comprehend and apply what they are reading, they will do better in other core areas.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In the 23-24 school year, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FAST PM3 ELA exam will increase from 62% to 65%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring data in the areas of ELA, math, science, and social studies as well as attendance and referral data, and teacher walkthoughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Misty Bernard (mistyjb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A focus on high yield instructional strategies will continue this year, and it will include emphasis on text-dependent questioning. Administrators will watch for evidence of the implementation of this strategy during classroom walkthroughs and observations and provide feedback and subsequent coaching as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The School District has placed an emphasis on four high yield instructional strategies for multiple years and has provided training for teachers to be able to implement them effectively. We will continue to focus on these strategies based on the research of their effectiveness and for continuity. In addition, having the ability to read and analyze text and then use to to form thoughtful answers will assist students in their performance on the ELA assessment. This strategy also aligns with Marzano's framework and our focus on content, context, and feedback.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Regular attendance is essential to the learning process so student attendance will be monitored. The PBIS Committee will create incentives to encourage students to attend school regularly and will celebrate growth for those students with a pattern of excessive absences. Additionally, a school process is in place that requires teachers to contact parent/guardians when students have been absent five or more days. If the student's attendance does not improve, the teacher alerts the school counselor, school social worker, and administration. Parent contact is then initiated by the social worker and is followed up on by administration. When necessary, students are placed on attendance contracts.

Person Responsible: Kelly Heinzman-Britton (kellymh@leeschools.net)

By When: The PBIS Committee will meet monthly and will develop quarterly attendance incentives. Administration will communicate with the social worker weekly.

Alternative to suspension programs will be instituted to change behaviors and keep students in school. For example, the Serve to Success program will offer after-school tutoring for students who receiving discipline referrals and falling behind in classes. Providing supports for students to be successful in class may help minimize disruptive behaviors in school.

Person Responsible: Kelly Heinzman-Britton (kellymh@leeschools.net)

By When: Attendance incentives will be implemented by the end of the first quarter. The Serve to Success program will be in place by the end of August.

Students will be placed in Intensive Reading and Social Studies/research classes to help remediate or enhance their literacy skills. Teachers will be assigned to these classes based on expertise and their ability to build relationships with students. ELA teachers will be assigned to grade levels and courses to have the greatest impact on students. The strongest teachers will be placed in areas of highest need. Support facilitators' schedules will be designed to pair the most effective teachers with the students needing the most support. Teachers will use District Instructional Guides to ensure alignment of benchmarks and appropriate level of rigor.

Person Responsible: Misty Bernard (mistyjb@leeschools.net)

By When: The master schedule will be complete before the start of the school year. Use of Instructional Guides will be monitored through walkthroughs each week.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Last year nearly ten teachers either left public education for private school or left education all together. They did this is the middle of the school year, thus leaving students without a qualified instructor in the classroom. In order to provide high quality instruction for students, we must recruit and retain high quality teachers.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In the 2023-2024 school year, three or fewer teachers will resign from the school prior to the end of the year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through staff climate surveys and staff attendance records.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Heinzman-Britton (kellymh@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

New teachers will be provided a mentor with whom they meet weekly. These mentors will observe the new teachers' classrooms and provide supports each month. They will also help identify areas in which teachers need additional professional development. In addition, the principal will meet for a monthly check-in with each teacher new to FMHS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that teacher mentor programs increase teacher retention as well as effective instructional practice. Creating a support network as well as targeted professional development will provide teachers with the resources they need to be successful.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Effective and highly effective mentor teachers will be identified and paired with new teachers, and time for mentoring and collaborating will be built in to the weekly schedule. The assistant principal overseeing the mentoring program will review expectations and will monitor the scheduling of weekly meetings. Targeted professional development will be provided monthly.

Person Responsible: Kelly Heinzman-Britton (kellymh@leeschools.net)

By When: New teachers will be paired with their mentors and the first quarter's professional development activities will be in place by the second week of school.

Investment in the school and a family atmosphere will be cultivated through team building activities with the staff. The schedule will be built to allow teachers to eat together during the school day and social activities outside of the work day will be planned at least once a quarter.

Person Responsible: Steven Cato (stevenc@leeschools.net)

By When: The first quarter social gatherings will be planned by the end of August. Subsequent gatherings will be planned by the end of the first month of each quarter.

No description entered

Person Responsible: Kelly Heinzman-Britton (kellymh@leeschools.net)

By When: Professional development will take place on the third Tuesday of each month.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

◦ Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring