North Fort Myers High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

North Fort Myers High School

5000 ORANGE GROVE BLVD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://nfm.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.

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, 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
Diggs, Debbie	Principal	
Conn, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Amaya, Ronda	Assistant Principal	
Hutchinson, Samantha	Assistant Principal	
Cook, Susan	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Blakely, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Cole, Anne	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Iriarte, Natasha	Teacher, K-12	Foreign Language Department Chair
Kamphouse, Garry	Teacher, PreK	CTE Department Chair
Johnson, Sara	Teacher, PreK	Performing Arts Department Chair
Maldonado, Felipe	Teacher, K-12	Visual Arts Department Chair
Erickson, Nick	Teacher, PreK	PE Department Chair
Mack, Dwayne	Assistant Principal	
Peruski, Jacilynn	Teacher, ESE	
Castillo, Desiree	Reading Coach	

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.

The focus areas were identified by our district for all high schools this year as determined by prior year data and required ESSA component. The SAC will be provided the SIP plan for review.

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))

NFMHS will monitor our SIP regularly in our Admin PLC, Leadership PLC, and Common Course PLCs through data analysis that is grade, course, and student specific. We will work to revise our strategies, processes, and resources based on student need and results of data analysis.

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	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	77%
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	
	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	
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	

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*	50	47	50	71	49	51	73		
ELA Learning Gains				57			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			47		
Math Achievement*	52	34	38	56	33	38	60		
Math Learning Gains				48			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			36		
Science Achievement*	73	54	64	62	35	40	80		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	58	66	78	40	48	75		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	98	84	89	98	49	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	79	65	65	84	60	67	96		
ELP Progress	64	36	45	55			78		

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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

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	697
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	37	Yes	3	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	43			
HSP	66			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	73			

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%
FRL	63			

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	36	Yes	2	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	49			
HSP	59			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	57			

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	50			52			73	70		98	79	64
SWD	15			15			28	39		30	6	
ELL	22			33			43	31		40	7	64
AMI												
ASN	69			92			91				3	
BLK	44			29			64	33			4	
HSP	43			47			68	72		74	7	60
MUL	50			52			70	60		60	6	

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
PAC												
WHT	54			56			76	73		81	6	
FRL	45			44			68	56		72	7	57

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	71	57	42	56	48	46	62	78		98	84	55
SWD	19	26	22	16	27	30	28	46		97	47	
ELL	35	42	46	36	55		26	70		92	55	55
AMI												
ASN	74	79		92	77		85	100		91	90	
BLK	47	39	28	40	42	40	33	40		100	79	
HSP	67	54	37	48	43	45	52	80		97	83	47
MUL	75	73		60	50		72	68		100	64	
PAC												
WHT	74	58	46	60	49	49	67	81		98	85	
FRL	59	53	42	43	45	42	49	69		97	80	50

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	73	59	47	60	32	36	80	75		99	96	78
SWD	29	29	29	26	26	25	42	32		100	71	
ELL	47	65	71	53	31	40				92	92	78
AMI												
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	86
MUL	71	52		64	29		80	64				
PAC												
WHT	74	58	48	64	33	40	79	77		100	96	
FRL	59	51	41	43	30	35	65	68		99	94	

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	65%	45%	20%	50%	15%
09	2023 - Spring	63%	46%	17%	48%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	30%	39%	-9%	50%	-20%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	43%	22%	48%	17%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	50%	22%	63%	9%

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.

Algebra was the data component that showed the lowest performance with a 30% proficiency rate. Our county endured a major hurricane that impacted our students and community with devastating damage, resulting in almost a month of instructional time lost. This was a contributing factor, along with a new assessment and standards.

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

ELA proficiency declined from 71% to 64% and Social Studies dropped from 78% to 71%. Our county and school have noted a steady decline in ELA scores since the inception of COVID that resulted in loss of consistent face time instruction. Additionally, we endured a major hurricane in the fall that impacted our students and community with devastating damage, resulting in almost a month of instructional time lost. Students, teachers, and the community dealt with devastation, personally and emotionally.

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.

Algebra had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We had a 30% proficiency rate, while the state was at 32%. Lee County endured a major hurricane, which resulted in a loss of almost a month of instructional time.

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

Biology showed the most improvement, going from 62% to 72% proficiency. We were able to be fully staffed with great teachers in this area all year. During Common Course Collaboration time, teams reviewed data and planned for instruction. The Biology teachers also provided review sessions during the school day so that all students could attend right before the assessment.

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

While the 9-12 EWS data from Part 1 is not currently viewable, one of our major areas of concern continues to be chronic absenteeism at all grade levels.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Graduation Rate
4. 9th grade
5. Attendance

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 focus area was identified by our district for all high schools this year as determined by prior graduation rate data.

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

Increase the number of Freshmen who are on track for graduation from 47% (at the beginning of 9th grade) to 57% as measured by proficiency on the 9th grade FAST ELA and BEST Alg 1 EOC, having a minimum state GPA of at least 2.0 and having earned at least 6 credits by June 2024.

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

Use a district created freshmen Early Warning System dashboard, we will regularly monitor GPA, credits and progress toward passing the reading and math state assessments. Attendance will also be monitored through our attendance tracker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Hutchinson (samanthamh@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.)

All 9th grade students will be closely monitored and provided an interest inventory at the beginning of the year in order to get to know each student, as well as connect them to our school culture (whether that be through AICE, Arts, Athletics, Clubs and/or activities).

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

Research shows that student involvement and engagement in school can positively predict and effect academic success. It is important that our students feel a sense of belonging and connection.

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.

1. Create interest inventory for 9th grade students.
2. Document current involvement and/or possible interests on 9th grade tracker.
3. Assist students with connecting with the appropriate people/providing information.
4. APC and Guidance will work with non-connected 9th graders.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

By When: We will review 9th grade data during our monthly Guidance Department Meeting.

1. Create a 9th grade tracker that includes tabs for attendance, grades, and information from the interest inventory.
2. Review academic achievement of each 9th grade student on tracker (quarterly). If students fail a course we will replace an elective with E2020.
3. Review attendance for each 9th grade student biweekly and intervene if students display chronic absences or trends in absences.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

By When: This process will be on-going all school year. Data will be reviewed in PLCs (Admin and Guidance) and interventions will take place as needed for individual students.

During the summer, our MTSS Coordinator analyzed students in MTSS to see where they were in the process, if students had been exited- why? how are they doing, if never in MTSS she reviewed their academic history, test scores, and performance to see if eligible to enter MTSS tier 2.

Person Responsible: Desiree Castillo (desireeac@leeschools.net)

By When: This process will be continuous throughout the school year. This will be a standing item on our Admin PLC agenda, as well as our Guidance PLC agenda. Principal and APC will work with the MTSS Coordinator.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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 focus area was identified by our district for all high schools this year as determined by prior ELA assessment data.

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

Increase 10th Grade ELA Proficiency from 58% (this cohort's 9th grade ELA proficiency rate) to 66% as measured by the FAST ELA by June 2024.

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

An administrator will oversee the work of the ELA Common Course PLC. This will include attending the PLC, assisting with the review of data, and providing resources as needed. Our Reading Coach will also review data and assist our ELA teachers as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Debbie Diggs (debbieldi@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.)

The 10th Grade ELA and Intensive Reading classes will track student data
through teacher tracking processes and student tracking processes. Teachers will use
targeted vocabulary instruction, high-yield strategies, small group instruction and
scaffolding. All 10th grade ELA and Reading teachers have the same planning period. Teachers will
review data and plan for instruction.

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

High-yield strategies have been proven to show 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.

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.

1. Administer progress monitoring and benchmark assessments
2. Analyze student data to guide instructional practices/create extension activities and interventions
3. Incorporate evidence based strategies to target specific deficiencies
4. Reassess after instruction

Person Responsible: Debbie Diggs (debbieldi@leeschools.net)

By When: Biweekly during Common Course PLC

Teachers will have the opportunity to view instructional practices in real time through instructional rounds. High-yield strategies will be modeled in each content area for

Person Responsible: Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

By When: Instructional rounds will be scheduled quarterly. Admin will put together the schedule, encourage all teachers to participate, and keep track of the teachers that attend and model. Admin will follow-up with teachers that have questions, or need support.

Admin and our Reading Coach will provide PD opportunities monthly on high-yield strategies.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be a standing item on our Leadership PLC. We will discuss the strategy that will modeled.

#3. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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 focus area was identified by our district for all high schools this year as determined by prior graduation rate data.

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

Increase Graduation Rate from 98% in 2023 to 99% in 2024 as measured by the number of standard diplomas earned by the FY24 Senior cohort by June 2024.

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

Our FY24 Senior students will be closely tracked for on-time graduation through our grad tracker created in house, as well as the district Grad Tracker in Power-Bi. Each counselor will review academic histories as well to ensure accuracy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@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.)

We will work closely with each Senior to review their graduation status based on the requirements still needed on a regular basis. Counselors and admin will create an individualized plan based on risk level. Each counselor will review their Senior caseload and work with admin on any student that is at risk to ensure that the support, communication, and proper resources are provided.

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

Knowing each student and their individual circumstance, academically, personally, and emotionally is key. The Grad Tracker has been a very reliable and useful tool for several years. It is a great strategy that provides real-time information on every Senior for multiple people to monitor.

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.

1. The graduation tracker is created with all graduation requirements and every senior attached.
2. The graduation tracker is closely monitored by the Guidance Department and admin throughout the school year.
3. The graduation tracker is updated as needed (test scores, credits, GPA).
4. The Guidance Team meets with each Senior regularly to go over their data and provides support,

resources, and/or a plan for success.

5. Parents are regularly notified and are involved in the process for successful and timely graduation.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

By When: This process is on-going all year. The Guidance PLC (includes APC) reviews this information weekly.

Each Senior will attend a senior contract meeting with their guidance counselor the first month of school. The meeting entails a comprehensive academic history review, graduation requirements that are still needed (includings credits and testing), a plan for on-time graduation, and resources needed. Each Senior receives a printed copy of this information, and the parents receive an email as well.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

By When: APC will work with the guidance team to plan for the senior contract meetings. The APC will also send out a parent messenger to communicate when these meetings will take place.

In the Fall, we will host a Senior Parent Night to go over graduation requirements, important dates and deadlines, scholarship information, and also have an open lab for FAFSA. This event, along with continuous communication throughout the school year will keep parents informed and involved.

Person Responsible: Keri Tutterrow (keriat@leeschools.net)

By When: The team will review the school calendar to select a date for this event. Communication will be provided through Senior Google Classroom, our school website, newsletter, and parent messenger.

Admin and our MTSS Coordinator reviewed all upcoming Seniors in the summer that do not have a test score for graduation requirements. Our MTSS Coordinator analyzed students over the summer in MTSS to see where they were in the process, if students had been exited- why? how are they doing, if never in MTSS she reviewed their academic history, test scores, and performance to see if eligible to enter MTSS tier 2.

Person Responsible: Desiree Castillo (desireeac@leeschools.net)

By When: This process will be continuous throughout the school year. This will be a standing item on our Admin PLC agenda, as well as our Guidance PLC agenda. Principal and APC will work with the MTSS Coordinator.

#4. 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.

This is a state required area because we are below 41% in ESSA data for SWD.

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

Students with disabilities identified on the Federal ESSA Index will improve performance in tested areas from 36% to 41% as calculated in FloridaCIMS.org by July 2024.

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

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 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.)

Teachers will incorporate scaffolding tasks, skill/task modeling and explicit vocabulary instruction.

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

Research shows 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.

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.

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

5. Particular attention will be made in ELA, Math and Bio. All other areas were above the 41%.

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

By When: Continuously implemented throughout the year via administrative walkthroughs and common course collaboration time biweekly.

Over the summer, the MTSS Coordinator reviewed all student data for those NOT identified as ESE or in Tier 2 of MTSS to determine who may need more intensive interventions.

Person Responsible: Desiree Castillo (desireeac@leeschools.net)

By When: Analysis completed by August 10.

Staff at least 1 content specific ESE teacher to provide push-in support services for each core.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Conn (kimberlyaco@leeschools.net)

By When: Completed by August 10.

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to
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.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

At the beginning of the school year, the SAC reviews our SIP goals and planned interventions. Items needing a funding source are shared with the SAC for their approval of expending School Improvement Funds. A funding request is ONLY taken to the SAC if directly supports one of the SIP goals.

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

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

not Title I

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

not Title I

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

not Title I

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

not Title I

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

not Title I

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

not Title I

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

not Title I

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

not Title I

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

not Title I

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Graduation: Graduation	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes