

The School District of Lee County

Mariner Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	28
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Mariner Middle School

425 CHIQUITA BLVD N, Cape Coral, FL 33993

<http://mrm.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.

Mariner Middle's Mission/Vision: Through a challenging educational experience, Mariner Middle School will develop lifelong learners who appreciate differences and create a better and peaceful world through mutual compassion and respect. These ideals will help me on my journey to Determine Who I Become.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mariner Middle's Mission/Vision: Through a challenging educational experience, Mariner Middle School will develop lifelong learners who appreciate differences and create a better and peaceful world through mutual compassion and respect. These ideals will help me on my journey to Determine Who I Become.

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
Clark, Mason	Principal	Craft initial SIP framework. Lead stakeholder input and updates to plan. Lead implementation of plan.
McCreary, Alanna	Assistant Principal	Build master schedule to address goals and needs of SIP. Provide ongoing feedback for SIP updates.
Knecht, James	Assistant Principal	Lead efforts to support SIP goals and needs as they pertain to attendance and discipline. Provide input for subsequent SIP updates.
Graham, Keith	Dean	Support implementation of the SIP as it pertains to attendance and discipline. Provide input for subsequent SIP updates.

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.

School Advisory council members will receive a review copy of the initial SIP draft on our before August 14, 2023.

The SAC will meet on August 24, 2023 to discuss the review copy. Feedback provided at the SAC meeting will be used to further develop the SIP.

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))

We will monitor SIP implementation and progress towards SIP goals after each FAST progress-monitoring cycle. Revisions will be developed by the school leadership team and written into the SIP as ongoing revisions.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	77	114	121	312
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	47	105
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	108	133	332
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	75	61	174
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	58	120	105	283

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	4	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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	33	61	53	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	22	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	75	126	283
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	75	126	283
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	81	103	250
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	90	84	242
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	123	150	371
	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	166	337	210	713

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) 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	33	61	53	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	22	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	75	126	283
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	75	126	283
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	81	103	250
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	90	84	242
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	123	150	371
	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	166	337	210	713

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*	43	48	49	45	48	50	49		
ELA Learning Gains				48			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			34		
Math Achievement*	61	56	56	48	32	36	51		
Math Learning Gains				51			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			43		
Science Achievement*	40	45	49	38	51	53	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	58	64	68	63	53	58	56		
Middle School Acceleration	82	80	73	54	45	49	54		
Graduation Rate					44	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	35	29	40	33	78	76	44		

* 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	60			
BLK	51			
HSP	52			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	50			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	43			

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	43			61			40	58	82			35
SWD	13			24			17	34			4	
ELL	28			49			41	48	73		6	36
AMI												
ASN	44			75							2	
BLK	29			48			25	61	91		5	
HSP	43			58			39	57	80		6	33
MUL	61			61			58	67			4	
PAC												
WHT	44			65			42	59	81		5	
FRL	39			56			37	54	79		6	36

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	45	48	41	48	51	50	38	63	54			33
SWD	15	32	30	23	40	39	19	49	23			
ELL	40	50	42	41	56	59	24	72	52			33
AMI												
ASN	50			75								
BLK	39	52	42	31	42	35	29	43				
HSP	46	52	44	47	53	56	36	64	56			32
MUL	40	42		46	54	70	27	67				
PAC												
WHT	46	45	41	51	49	44	41	66	50			
FRL	40	45	36	42	46	44	35	57	54			35

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	49	48	34	51	48	43	49	56	54			44
SWD	21	30	32	21	36	43	23	35				
ELL	36	54	44	36	41	47	17	34	27			44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	42	23	38	43	35	40	63	50			
HSP	46	48	33	45	43	33	38	50	44			41
MUL	47	39		45	54	60	55	50				
PAC												
WHT	51	50	40	58	53	52	58	60	59			
FRL	45	46	27	43	44	36	42	51	44			33

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
07	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	47%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	44%	-5%	47%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	44%	-2%	47%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	54%	12%
07	2023 - Spring	32%	37%	-5%	48%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	39%	43%	-4%	44%	-5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	39%	46%	50%	35%

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

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	59%	-5%	66%	-12%

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.

English Language Arts returned the lowest performance for 2022-2023 (38% in our predicted school grade file). This past school year represented the third annual decline for ELA at Mariner Middle School, a pattern we had hoped to reverse. Unfortunately, two important ELA positions were unstaffed most of the year. These positions without highly qualified teachers returned significantly more Level 1 and Level 2 students.

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

English Language Arts returned the greatest decline for 2022-2023 (7% in our predicted school grade file). This past school year represented the third annual decline for ELA at Mariner Middle School, a pattern we had hoped to reverse. Unfortunately, two important ELA positions were unstaffed most of the year. These positions without highly qualified teachers returned significantly more Level 1 and Level 2 students.

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.

English Language Arts showed the greatest gap when compared with the state average. In 6th grade, our students achieved 15% below the state average. In 7th grade, our students were 1% below the state average and in 8th grade, our students achieved 8% below the state average. Unfortunately, two important ELA positions were unstaffed most of the year. These positions without highly qualified teachers returned significantly more Level 1 and Level 2 students. Additionally, it appeared to me that ELA was understaffed. We are working to increase teachers in ELA.

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

The acceleration component demonstrated a 30% increase in 2022-2023 (54% to 84% in our predicted school grade file). Mathematics was overhired by design (11 teachers), but we also replaced both algebra I teachers with high-performing teachers skilled a positive relationships. Finally, we ensured that students who earned grade-level performance or higher in 2021-2022 had the opportunity to access the algebra I curriculum.

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

Attendance continues to be a concern. We do not have a healthy Tier I for attendance, as it is below 70%. Another concern is that a bubble of EWS students with two or more indicators are moving into 8th grade, in which they will be impacting proficiency ALL cells except Civics

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

1. Moving the collective performance of students within ESE subgroup above 30%.
2. Reversing the ELA decline in performance

3. Building upon Science performance gains in 2022-2023.
4. Maintaining the very significant increase in mathematics and acceleration.

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.

Performance of students in the SWD subgroup lost 8% in 2020-2021, earned 30% proficiency overall. In 2021-2022, this 30% achievement was repeated.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase the SWD achievement 10% over achievement in 2021-2022. This would result in a 2023-2024 achievement of 33% or greater.

Monitoring:

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

We will disaggregate PM data to determine how students in the SWD subgroup are performing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mason Clark (masonmc@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 are reallocating staff members skilled in ESE interventions to the ESE department.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We entered 2021-2022 with essentially no instructional staff in inclusion-based ESE positions. A few teachers completed all of the IEPs, and push-in support was relegated to paraprofessional educators. We have staffed a Learning Lab with a skills reading/ESE teacher. We have created two inclusion support positions to complement our paraprofessional support. Finally, we placed a strong ESE/Reading teacher into our self-contained social functioning classroom to support students on regular assessment.

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.

Staffing: We need to adequately staff our ESE department.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/10/2023

Training--our new ESE department members must understand their responsibilities with IEPs, intervention, and mentorship

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 9/2/2023

Monitoring--we will monitor SWDs for academic achievement on the progress monitoring assessments as well as classroom grades.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

Performance of students in the Black subgroup lost 1% in 2021-2022, earned 41% proficiency overall.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Performance of students within the Black subgroup will increase by 10% for 2023-2024, resulting in a performance of 45% or greater.

Monitoring:

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

Progress-monitoring assessments as well as classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mason Clark (masonmc@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.)

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

#5. 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.

Overall ELA has decreased three years in a row to a predicted 37% in 2022-2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We seek to reverse this trend and increase our score to 45%

Monitoring:

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

We will use district exemplar data as well as FAST Progress Monitoring Fall and Winter data to monitor progress towards this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alanna McCreary (alannalm@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.)

Mariner Middle School has essentially completed Marzano Level 1 Certification. We are beginning to explore Marzano Level 2. Level 2 focuses on an effective teacher in every classroom. Our initial element of focus is providing scales and rubrics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing Scales and rubrics is a well-studied instructional practice that has a 0.7 to 0.8 effect size when implement effectively. We believe that this student daily focus on learning goals will yield increased achievement across our school.

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.

Engage in Level 1 Certification schoolwide

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 9/1/2023

Purchase staff copies of The Handbook of Art and Science of Teaching to support professional learning throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Accomplished Spring, 2023

Create a PD plan for introduction of important instructional elements throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/2/2023

Introduce staff to the element Providing Scales and Rubrics

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/8/2023

Monitor staff implementation of scale and rubrics as they develop skill with this element.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly, with a follow-ups to share great practice within our staff body.

Monitor PM1 and PM2 of FAST to gauge the lagging variable of student achievement.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Fall and Winter administrations.

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Our Math scores increased by 16% in 2022-2023. These gains are significant, and we are hoping to solidify them for 2023-2024.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Mariner Middle School math achievement will remain in the A-range for 2023-2024 (62%+)

Monitoring:

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

We will use district exemplar data as well as FAST Progress Monitoring Fall and Winter data to monitor progress towards this goal.

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.)

Mariner Middle School has essentially completed Marzano Level 1 Certification. We are beginning to explore Marzano Level 2. Level 2 focuses on an effective teacher in every classroom. Our initial element of focus is providing scales and rubrics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing Scales and rubrics is a well-studied instructional practice that has a 0.7 to 0.8 effect size when implement effectively. We believe that this student daily focus on learning goals will yield increased achievement across our school.

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.

Engage in Level 1 Certification schoolwide

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 9/1/2023

Purchase staff copies of The Handbook of Art and Science of Teaching to support professional learning throughout the school year.
accomplished Spring, 2023

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/2/2023

Create a PD plan for introduction of important instructional elements throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: 8/2/2023

Introduce staff to the element Providing Scales and Rubrics

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/8/2023

Monitor staff implementation of scale and rubrics as they develop skill with this element.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly, with a follow-ups to share great practice within our staff body.

Monitor PM1 and PM2 of FAST to gauge the lagging variable of student achievement.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Fall and Winter administrations.

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Our science achievement reversed a negative trend in 2022-2023, increasing by 2% in 2022-2023. However, our proficiency remains low, at 40%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Science proficiency will increase from 40% in 2022-2023 to 48% in 2023-2024.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our district progress monitor assessments and the new state science test.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mason Clark (masonmc@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.)

For the first time in several years, Mariner Middle School has been able to place three effective, experienced physical science teachers in the eighth grade. Additionally, Mariner Middle School has essentially completed Marzano Level 1 Certification. We are beginning to explore Marzano Level 2. Level 2 focuses on an effective teacher in every classroom. Our initial element of focus is providing scales and rubrics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The instructional effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom is crucial, so we believe that hiring an experienced physical science team alone will increase achievement. Additionally, providing Scales and rubrics is a well-studied instructional practice that has a 0.7 to 0.8 effect size when implement effectively. We believe that this student daily focus on learning goals will yield increased achievement across our school.

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.

Engage in Level 1 Certification schoolwide

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 9/1/2023

Purchase staff copies of The Handbook of Art and Science of Teaching to support professional learning throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Accomplished Spring, 2023

Create a PD plan for introduction of important instructional elements throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/2/2023

Introduce staff to the element Providing Scales and Rubrics

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/8/2023

Monitor staff implementation of scale and rubrics as they develop skill with this element.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly, with a follow-ups to share great practice within our staff body.

Monitor district progress-monitoring results throughout the school year and then the results of the new state science assessment to gauge the lagging variable of student achievement.
Fall and Winter administrations.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Fall and Winter administrations.

#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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.

Our Civics results are relatively strong and have been over the past several years. However, Civics remains a significant portion of the school grading formula, and we do have a new staff member joining our Civics team.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Civics scores will increase from 60% in 2022-2023 to 64% in 2023-2024.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor district civics progress-monitoring assessments as well as the state EOC for civics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Knecht (jimck@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.)

Mariner Middle School has essentially completed Marzano Level 1 Certification. We are beginning to explore Marzano Level 2. Level 2 focuses on an effective teacher in every classroom. Our initial element of focus is providing scales and rubrics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing Scales and rubrics is a well-studied instructional practice that has a 0.7 to 0.8 effect size when implement effectively. We believe that this student daily focus on learning goals will yield increased achievement across our school.

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.

Engage in Level 1 Certification schoolwide

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 9/1/2023

Purchase staff copies of The Handbook of Art and Science of Teaching to support professional learning throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: accomplished Spring, 2023

Create a PD plan for introduction of important instructional elements throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/2/2023

Introduce staff to the element Providing Scales and Rubrics

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/8/2023

Monitor staff implementation of scale and rubrics as they develop skill with this element.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly, with a follow-ups to share great practice within our staff body.

Monitor PM1 and PM2 of FAST to gauge the lagging variable of student achievement.

Person Responsible: Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)

By When: Fall and Winter administrations.

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.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
---	--------	--	--------

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
7	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
8	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$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