

The School District of Lee County

Mariner High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Mariner High School

701 CHIQUITA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

<http://mrh.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 ensure student learning through purposeful student engagement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a world class education.

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
Michel, Tom	Principal	<p>Instructional and Transformational Leader for 1850 students and 150 personnel members.</p> <p>Regulates faculty and personnel recruitment, staffing and evaluations.</p> <p>Unifies teachers and staff through building authentic relationships.</p> <p>Conducts formal evaluations for TALC and SPALC personnel.</p> <p>Collaborates with departments to facilitate professional learning communities.</p> <p>Team leader that collaborates with Social Studies and JROTC Teams to monitor student proficiency, learning gains and the implementation of academic interventions.</p> <p>School Advisory Committee (SAC) leader.</p>
White, Roberta	Assistant Principal	<p>Uses student achievement and standardized test scores to create the master schedule ensuring that students were properly placed based on their present and past test scores and academic records.</p> <p>Reviews and examines teacher data to create teacher assignments that directly impacted student learning, discipline and achievement.</p> <p>Mentors students from the lowest 25% to increase student achievement including; monitoring student academic progress, analyzing student test data, meeting with students throughout the school year to review progress, keeping open communication with parents, and communicating with teachers concerning individual student progress.</p> <p>Provides an equitable master schedule that provides for the needs of all students while adhering to state and district guidelines.</p> <p>Conducts formal evaluations for TALC and SPALC personnel.</p> <p>Collaborates with departments to facilitate professional learning communities.</p> <p>Team leader that collaborates with Math and School Counseling Teams to monitor student proficiency, learning gains and the implementation of academic interventions.</p> <p>Facilitates and helps to plan APC meetings as an APC Leader.</p> <p>Mentor aspiring leaders at the school and district level.</p>
Gedde, Beth	Assistant Principal	<p>Responsible for the leadership, coordination, oversight and implementation of student support, including attendance.</p> <p>Assist Department Chair of Career and Technical Education to support</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>industry certification testing within our academies.</p> <p>Annual collaboration with Principal, Assistant Principal for Student Affairs, and Technology Support Specialist to develop and analyze instructional technology to eliminate barriers from achieving School Improvement Plan.</p> <p>Support signature programs by maintaining accurate records of all certifications to ensure CAPE funding and by providing instructional guidance in order to increase program success.</p> <p>Serve as the Career and Technical Education and Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) Goal Team Leader.</p> <p>Conducts formal evaluations for TALC and SPALC personnel.</p> <p>Collaborates with departments to facilitate professional learning communities.</p> <p>Team leader that collaborates with CTE and Foreign Language Teams to monitor student proficiency, learning gains and the implementation of academic interventions.</p> <p>Develops community relationships and market the school image through the use of all social mediums (Twitter, Facebook, school website and school newsletter).</p> <p>Plans and facilitates Advisory Board meetings for our Outboard Services Technology Academy.</p>
<p>Higgins, Robert</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>Strategic planner responsible for creating the procedures and protocols for student support systems which include utilizing restorative justice practices with discipline procedures and creating behavioral interventions.</p> <p>Responsible for the leadership, coordination, oversight of school facilities, SREF, custodial services and security teams.</p> <p>Plans, coordinates, and monitors monthly drills (fire, lockdown, tornado, evacuation) to ensure a safe learning environment.</p> <p>Team leader that collaborates with Science team to monitor student proficiency, learning gains and the implementation of academic interventions.</p> <p>Conducts formal evaluations for TALC and SPALC personnel.</p> <p>Collaborates with departments to facilitate professional learning communities.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McNeeley, Angel	Assistant Principal	<p>Strategic planner responsible for creating the procedures and protocols for student support systems which include utilizing restorative justice practices with discipline procedures and creating behavioral interventions.</p> <p>Data-based instructional leader that designs professional development for teachers to use research-based practices for more rigorous lesson planning and classroom instruction.</p> <p>Academic career coach that designs and implements the new teacher onboarding and first year professional development program.</p> <p>Team leader that collaborates with English, Reading, and Art/Music Teams to monitor student proficiency, learning gains and the implementation of academic interventions.</p> <p>Coordinator of ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) program and strategically plans for differentiated and equitable learning opportunities.</p> <p>Coordinates School Improvement Plan, Volunteer Operations, Staff Recognitions and Celebrations, and Grant Program.</p> <p>Mentor for first year Assistant Principals.</p> <p>Conducts formal evaluations for TALC and SPALC personnel.</p> <p>Collaborates with departments to facilitate professional learning communities.</p>

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 School Leadership Team (which consists of school Department Chairs, Reading Coach, and Administration) assist in the SIP data analysis and goal creation. The SIP is reviewed by the School Advisory Council and by the School District as well. Leadership Team meetings are once a month and data will be reviewed systematically and analyzed after state assessments and progress monitoring assessments.

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))

Administration meets once a week and SIP goals/Action Plans will be reviewed.
 Leadership Team meetings are once a month, and data will be reviewed monthly and after every state assessment (retake or progress monitoring).
 SIP goals will be systematically reviewed and revised after semester one to ensure the overall goals will be met.

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	95%
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) 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	774
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	710
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	908
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	571
	0	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	774

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	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	29	47	50	46	49	51	41		
ELA Learning Gains				41			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				23			41		
Math Achievement*	30	34	38	33	33	38	31		
Math Learning Gains				37			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			12		
Science Achievement*	50	54	64	52	35	40	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	50	58	66	53	40	48	54		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	97	84	89	94	49	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	75	65	65	80	60	67	67		
ELP Progress	54	36	45	51			58		

** 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	94

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	33	Yes	4	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	53			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	51			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	48			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	46			

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	29			30			50	50		97	75	54
SWD	8			9			17	18		39	7	45
ELL	15			20			32	30		72	7	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			19			51	33		65	6	
HSP	25			27			45	50		72	7	55
MUL	29			21			44	55		80	6	
PAC												
WHT	32			34			54	51		77	6	
FRL	26			26			47	47		66	7	49

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	46	41	23	33	37	44	52	53		94	80	51
SWD	14	23	13	10	27	32	34	24		91	52	
ELL	28	38	22	18	34	39	29	50		90	67	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	47		24	45	33	50	20		96	64	
HSP	44	38	22	26	35	44	45	49		94	78	50
MUL	55	52		33	36		54	30				
PAC												
WHT	48	43	23	40	38	46	58	61		94	84	
FRL	39	39	23	26	34	43	43	42		93	75	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	41	39	41	31	20	12	56	54		97	67	58
SWD	5	22	30	13	19	19	22	31		91	36	
ELL	19	53	59	19	19	10	38	33		97	58	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	32	30	18	8			41		100	41	
HSP	37	41	42	31	20	13	55	47		99	69	58
MUL	33	43		27	13		46	57		100	100	
PAC												
WHT	46	38	44	33	21	12	58	61		96	68	
FRL	30	34	36	25	20	11	47	43		96	59	62

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	42%	45%	-3%	50%	-8%
09	2023 - Spring	42%	46%	-4%	48%	-6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	14%	39%	-25%	50%	-36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	43%	-4%	48%	-9%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	50%	-5%	63%	-18%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	54%	-7%	63%	-16%

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.

In the 2022-2023 school year, overall Math Achievement showed a 33% proficiency level. The percentage of proficient students stayed the same from SY 21-22. Algebra I showed the lowest performance of the school accountability components with a 13% proficiency rating according to the testing platform. Contributing factors: Two algebra teachers left the school during SY 22-23 (One teacher left to take care of family out of state after Hurricane Ian in October and another left due to a cancer diagnosis in November). Despite ongoing proactive effort, we were unable to fill these two

positions the rest of the school year 22-23 The math classes were taught by one full time guest teacher and multiple part time guest teachers who were led by the Department Chair.

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

The College and Career Acceleration category is down by 5% from the prior School Year. Students were unsuccessful in the Digital Information Technology class having to pass three technology exams as a bundle.

We have since moved to another course offering where there is one exam, not three.

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.

Unsure of what state data shows in each area.

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

Grade 10, ELA, showed a slight increase from 39% to 42%. In addition, the graduation rate increased to 96%. In ELA, district coordinators were brought out three times throughout the school year to provide professional development for our ELA team on the new curriculum platform (StudySync), data collections, new standards, and new FAST assessments.

For the graduation rate, Administration and School Counseling Team used increased measures for data tracking seniors; Reading Coach provided one-on-one tutoring for SAT/ACT concordant scores for ELA reading assessment requirements; APC provided one-on-one math tutoring for Algebra assessment retakes; AP over attendance reviewed student attendance daily, by class period and met with social worker, school counseling team, and parents for attendance issues; ESOL and ESE teams provided interventions and supports throughout the school day; Back on Track program implemented extra after-school tutoring and online course assistance; Student Affairs combined after-hours school detentions with Back on Track services.

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

From last year's SIP and EWS information, overall school Attendance was an area of concern, specifically in the 9th grade. Also, in SY 2021 we had 175 students in the 10th grade have 2 or more EWS indicators. Those 10th graders are now our current seniors.

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

To raise student proficiency in four core areas: Math, English, Biology and US History.

To support our ESSA students (ESE, ELLs) in the classroom.

To build increased knowledge of student engagement in the classroom through shared teacher coaching and professional development.

To build a positive school culture and increase overall student attendance.

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.

To meet Federal Index requirements, Mariner High School will support the ESE population in the core assessed areas to close the achievement gap of the ESE student population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of ESE students in the 9th and 10th grade scoring at proficiency (levels 3-5) in ELA as reported on the FAST progress monitoring assessment will increase five percentage points from the baseline score, by the quarter three progress monitoring testing window.

Monitoring:

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

Area of focus will be measured using FAST progress monitoring assessments and District created exemplars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angel McNeeley (angelm@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.)

Using Marzano's High Yield Strategies (student engagement strategies) in the classroom.

Marzano's High Yield Strategies (student engagement strategies) include:

1. Identifying similarities and differences
2. Summarizing and Note-taking
3. Homework and practice
4. Reinforcing effort and providing recognition
5. Non-linguistic representation
6. Cooperative learning
7. Setting Objectives and providing feedback
8. Generating and testing hypothesis
9. Questions, cues and advanced organizers

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of high yield instructional strategies will authentically engage students in the meta-cognitive process to enhance student performance. The use of the strategy is evidenced by teacher lesson plans and instructional strategies and practices used in the classroom. High performing school systems understand that the use of research-based high yield instructional strategies improves instruction, learning and

achievement. High performing school systems understand that the quality of instruction is a more powerful achievement variable than students' background characteristics.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D. and Pollock, J. (2001). Classroom Instruction that Works – Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

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.

Administration will support, review and monitor teacher instructional practices for Marzano High Yield Instructional Strategies being used in the classroom. (Using Common Lesson Plans/Curriculum Maps/ Instructional Guides)

Person Responsible: Angel McNeeley (angeltm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly pop-ins with common look-fors in student engagement as tracked by systemwide google form.

Use FAST progress monitoring assessment/District created exemplars data to drive instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Angel McNeeley (angeltm@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly data checks in Professional Learning Communities.

Provide common planning for all PLC Teams (Mondays, 1:45 - 2:45).

Person Responsible: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly review of PLC team agendas, located in shared Google Drive, Staff Essentials, PLC folder.

Class-Size Reduction

Person Responsible: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

By When: Regularly (weekly) checks the master schedule to ensure core courses meeting the class size reduction standard.

Learning Strategies course for ESE students.

Person Responsible: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

By When: Regularly (weekly) works with school counseling team and ESE Department chair to ensure ESE students are scheduled into the learning strategies course for extra one-on-one support and intervention.

#2. 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.

In the 2022 - 2023 school year, 667 students were absent more than 10 days. The percent of students who fell below 90% attendance (or missing more than 10 instructional school days) was 35%. Our attendance goal is based on using research-based indicators to identify students at risk of failing to meet key educational milestones such as reading at grade level, on-time graduation, and college readiness.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students who have a below 90% attendance rate will decrease by 5% by the end of Semester 1 and Semester 2 of the 2023-2024 school year as compared to Semester 1 and Semester 2 of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

1. Monitor student daily attendance by class period
2. Calls home from Assistant Principal and School Social Worker in regards to attendance policy, excusal notes
3. Parent conferences, Academic Review Meetings at 10 Absences with Assistant Principal and School Social Worker
4. Student attendance contracts (denying students extra-curricular activities and events)
5. Celebrations to acknowledge students who have an attendance rate above 90%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Gedde (bethage@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.)

Positive Behavior Support Systems (PBIS).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Adopting a PBIS framework changes the focus of discipline from punishment of negative behaviors to recognition of positive ones. The social-emotional connection that teachers build with students through PBIS helps to build a positive school climate. Students who see school as a positive place to be are more apt to attend regularly.

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.

Monitor student daily attendance by class period.

Person Responsible: Beth Gedde (bethage@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

Calls home from Assistant Principal and School Social Worker in regards to attendance policy, excusal notes.

Person Responsible: Beth Gedde (bethage@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Parent conferences, Academic Review Meetings at 10 Absences with Assistant Principal and School Social Worker.

Person Responsible: Beth Gedde (bethage@leeschools.net)

By When: Every 10 student absences.

Student attendance contracts (denying students extra-curricular activities and events).

Person Responsible: Beth Gedde (bethage@leeschools.net)

By When: Each Semester.

Celebrations to acknowledge students who have an attendance rate above 90%.

Person Responsible: Beth Gedde (bethage@leeschools.net)

By When: Each Semester.

#3. 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.

Increasing reading and English Language Arts proficiency in grade 10.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of 10th grade students scoring at or above proficiency levels (levels 3-5) on the state assessment will increase by at least 5% as reported on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), Spring administration, 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Use the FAST progress monitoring data of 10th grade students and district-created exemplars. Ensure the Leadership Team (Department Chairs and Administration) meets once a month to review data and provide feedback and input.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angel McNeeley (angelm@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.)

Increase student engagement in the classroom.

Decrease disruption of the academic time.

Increase cross-curricular school leadership to support collaborative coaching and reviewing and analyzing student data. .

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of high yield instructional strategies will authentically engage students in the meta-cognitive process to enhance student performance. High performing school systems understand that the use of research-based high yield instructional strategies improves instruction, learning and achievement. High performing school systems understand that the quality of instruction is a more powerful achievement variable than students' background characteristics.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D. and Pollock, J. (2001). Classroom Instruction that Works – Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

The focus of this strategy is based on the Principal's framework that encompasses instructional leadership as a two-part plan: leadership functions and leadership processes. The leadership functions described include: (1) framing and communicating school goals; (2) supervising and evaluating instruction; (3) developing high academic standards and expectations, that include high yield instructional strategies; (4) monitoring student progress; (5) promoting the professional development of teachers; (6) and protecting instructional time. Hallinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1986). Instructional leadership in effective schools. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov>

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.

Increase student engagement in the classroom using Marzano High Yield Strategies.

Person Responsible: Tom Michel (thomasjm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly pop-ins with common look-fors in student engagement as tracked by systemwide google form.

Decrease disruption of the academic time by enforcing the schoolwide cell phone policy.

Person Responsible: Robert Higgins (robertah@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly administrative reports on student cell phone use referral data collected in FOCUS.

Increase cross-curricular leadership by meeting once a month as a Leadership PLC to discuss ELA goals schoolwide and overall student proficiency in ELA.

Person Responsible: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly Leadership team meetings to build leadership team skills in collaborative coaching; review overall student progress monitoring data in each core course; discuss what specific research-based instructional strategies are being used in the classroom to support ELA; and any specific feedback for further professional development.

The school's literacy leadership team is responsible for creating and monitoring the literacy initiatives throughout the campus. The team meets once a month to examine student data, discuss issues related to literacy teaching and implementation, assess the need for professional learning opportunities, promote literacy communication, and create and share literacy bell ringers and other literacy-based student engagement projects for our teachers (like "WOW" words of the week implementation.)

Person Responsible: Angel McNeeley (angelm@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly Meetings, Quarterly projects.

#4. 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.

Grade 9 cohort tracking for on-time graduation. Currently, there are 103 sophomores, 19% of the sophomore class, who are not on-track to graduate, with a 1.94 or below GPA. Our goal is to decrease the amount of 9th grade students not on-track for graduation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of 9th grade students who have a GPA of 2.0 or better to be considered on-track for graduation, will increase by at least 5% (an increase of 26 students) as reported by their last report card, in June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Student GPAs will be monitored by the Administration and School Counseling Team. GPA is only calculated after every semester, so GPA rankings and reviews can be completed mid-year and after last grade reporting.

Additional review of individual student course failings can be reviewed after every quarter to ensure proper interventions and support are given in a timely fashion.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roberta White (robertaaw@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.)

Explanation of high school graduation requirements and review of Academic Histories by School Counseling Team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to be aware of the graduation requirements for high school. that include specific courses, assessments required and the required GPA to graduate. In addition, students need information on how GPA is calculated, and how to read their academic histories for course information, grades, and GPA.

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.

School Counseling Team to provide graduation requirements training and academic review meeting with 9th grade cohort.

Person Responsible: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

By When: By the end of Semester 1, School Counseling Team to provide graduation requirements training and academic review meeting with 9th grade cohort.

Review of failing course grades in core courses by School Counseling Team and student meetings.

Person Responsible: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

By When: Each quarter, the School Counseling team will review failing course grades and meet with students to discuss.

After-School Tutoring to assist in improving failing courses.

Person Responsible: Roberta White (robertaaw@leeschools.net)

By When: Each quarter, the School Counseling team will review failing course grades and meet with students to discuss and offer after-school tutoring details for support.

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.