

The School District of Lee County

# Diplomat Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>25</b>

## Diplomat Middle School

1039 NE 16TH TER, Cape Coral, FL 33909

<http://dpm.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 inspire lifelong learning by building character and providing rich academic experiences in a safe learning environment.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Students today. Leaders tomorrow.

### 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
Bennington, Maura	Principal	Instructional leader of the school and oversees ELA and Science teams.
Milstein, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader of the school and oversees math, electives, and ESE.
Norris, Tanya	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader of the school and oversees social studies and reading.
Badger, Lauren	Administrative Support	Intervention support specialist (MTSS)
	Reading Coach	Reading coach who supports informational text standards and benchmarks for social studies, science, and electives teachers. Based on results of iReady, reading classes, PM1, and exemplars, she works with these teachers to identify standards that students are not experiencing success. she assists teachers with reading strategies and running small groups.

#### 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.

All teachers and the leadership team review data to identify student needs within subjects and grade levels. This information allows us to focus on specific needs to raise achievement. Administration meets with subject area collaborative teams to discuss grade level needs on standards and identify strategies that can be used to increase achievement.

**SIP Monitoring**

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

The SIP will be printed and given to each department chair and member of the leadership team. We will compare our incoming data, baseline data, district exemplars, and mid-year data to confirm our progress and make changes according to the results. We have to improve the percent of students who are proficient in two subgroups, ESE and ELL. Teachers will list their specific students on their lesson plans and will use high yield strategies to increase student achievement. If students are not making progress, then we will consider changes to their schedules, providing additional in-school and after school tutoring, and using additional high yield strategies.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	60%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C  2019-20: A  2018-19: A  2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	89	68	211	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	49	59	114	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	10	22	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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



Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	65	80	175

**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	2	0	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3

**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	54	89	68	211	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	49	59	114	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	10	22	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	65	80	175

**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	2	0	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	48	49	50	48	50	50		
ELA Learning Gains				50			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			36		
Math Achievement*	55	56	56	45	32	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				51			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			33		
Science Achievement*	39	45	49	39	51	53	35		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	64	68	62	53	58	62		
Middle School Acceleration	81	80	73	80	45	49	61		
Graduation Rate					44	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	40	29	40	34	78	76	50		

*\* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	20	Yes	4	2
ELL	28	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	45			
HSP	52			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	48			

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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	49			
HSP	48			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	47			

#### Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	50			55			39	56	81			40
SWD	18			22			12	22			5	28
ELL	25			33			9	33			5	40
AMI												
ASN	69			85							2	
BLK	43			48			44	45			4	
HSP	49			53			32	58	78		6	42
MUL	56			68			20	57			4	
PAC												
WHT	50			56			46	55	87		5	
FRL	44			50			32	50	72		6	38

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	50	50	42	45	51	50	39	62	80			34
SWD	18	42	46	17	37	34	14	21				17
ELL	29	48	43	30	45	46	13	46				34
AMI												
ASN	78	76		76	69							
BLK	53	54	53	36	45	41	38	69				
HSP	48	48	41	42	50	45	33	57	78			33
MUL	50	54		45	43							
PAC												
WHT	51	49	43	48	52	58	45	65	85			
FRL	44	46	39	38	47	48	36	54	82			34

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	50	50	36	50	41	33	35	62	61			50
SWD	19	33	27	14	32	24	15	28				27
ELL	33	51	34	34	42	34	21	29				50
AMI												
ASN	83	72		89	67							
BLK	49	59	58	39	44	27	33					
HSP	48	49	35	44	38	33	27	56	54			52
MUL	64	63		55	50			40				
PAC												
WHT	50	47	34	53	41	31	39	66	64			
FRL	45	49	40	45	40	31	30	60	59			44

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	47%	44%	3%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	44%	-1%	47%	-4%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	44%	9%	47%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	28%	37%	-9%	48%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	38%	43%	-5%	44%	-6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	39%	49%	50%	38%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	66%	-10%

### 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.**

Our lowest performing components are 8th grade science at a proficiency rate of 38%; 7th grade math with proficiency at 28%; ESE students with a reading proficiency of 9% and math proficiency of 21%, ELL students with a reading proficiency of 9% and math proficiency of 22%. Contributing factors to our

students' low performance include high rates of absences, lack of work completed by students, lack of cooperative learning, insufficient high yield strategies being used in the classrooms, and a lack of participation in learning due to absences and online learning. Our PLC process was not as cohesive as expected. We have begun to monitor our effective teaching in every classroom through High Reliability Schools and focus on a tight process for monitoring student progress in the classroom. We will have a stricter focus on the work of the PLCs and the specific standards needs of our students. The PLC work is being streamlined through data chats and an identified model of instruction. Our PLCs will have a clear vision of what data to analyze, what strategies to use in classes, and how to set goals with and for students.

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

The data component which shows the greatest decline is 7th grade math, a drop of 15% proficient from 43% to 28%. However, students in the 7th grade math classes this last year were all students who had scored at Levels 1 and 2 during the previous school year. So, although 28% is a low proficiency rate, considering that 100% of students were Levels 1 and 2-- increasing to 28% from 0% is a tremendous increase. We do intend to continue increasing the proficiency rate for 7th grade math 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.**

Our 7th Grade Math component is the greatest gap compared to the state. Our proficiency rate is 28% while the state proficiency rate is 48% -- a negative 20% gap. Contributing factors to our students' low performance include Hurricane Ian shutting down our school district for several weeks; after all schools went back to brick and mortar buildings Diplomat went to virtual school until our building was deemed safe to return to. Many of our families were impacted by the hurricane causing stress and anxiety, high rates of absences, lack of work completed by students, lack of cooperative learning, insufficient high yield strategies being used in the classrooms, and a lack of participation in learning due to absences and online learning. Our PLC process was not as cohesive as expected. We have begun to monitor our effective teaching in every classroom through High Reliability Schools and focus on a tight process for monitoring student progress in the classroom. We will have a stricter focus on the work of the PLCs and the specific standards needs of our students. The PLC work is being streamlined through data chats and an identified model of instruction. Our PLCs will have a clear vision of what data to analyze, what strategies to use in classes, and how to set goals with and for students.

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

The data component which shows the most improvement is 6th grade math, an increase of 30% proficient from 28% to 58%. However, all students in the 6th grade math classes this last year took the 6th grade FAST. Levels 1 So, although 58% is a high proficiency rate, this all 6th graders took the 6th grade test regardless of being on grade level or advanced. We do intend to continue increasing the proficiency rate for 6th grade math students.

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

Our subgroups with the greatest need are SWD and ELL. Both subgroups fell below the target of 41% mark- SWD: 9% in ELA; ELL: 9%. The SWD has now been below 41% for three years and ELL just fell below this year.

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

7th Grade Math proficiency  
8th Grade Science proficiency  
ELA proficiency all grades  
SWD Reading proficiency  
ELL Reading proficiency

**Area of Focus**

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



**#1. 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.

Diplomat's percentage of proficiency for the 8th grade science exam has been low these past three years. In the 2020-2021 year our proficiency rate was 38%. In 2021-2022, our rate was 39%, and in 2022-2023 our rate decreased back to 38%. This rate is 5% below our district average of 43%, and 6% below the state average of 44%. Science is a crucial need for our students and we cannot permit our proficiency scores to remain this low. We must increase our percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in their science knowledge each year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Diplomat Middle School will increase our student's proficiency from 38% to 45% as measured on the NGSSS at the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Assigned administrator and science team will monitor students' progress through:

Data analysis through Collaborative Teams on Tuesday mornings.

Bell work focused on identified high needs standards.

District Exemplars and analysis of needed standards.

Analysis of PM1 and PM2 and assignments focused on areas of need.

Spiral Review of 6th and 7th grade focus standards.

District created Instructional Guides and standards based presentations.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Maura Bennington (mauragb@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.)

High Yield Strategies will be used in all science classes, i.e., writing to raise achievement, higher order thinking, distributed summarizing, text based evidence, short and long responses, close reads, and hands on standards based labs. As a HRS Level 1 school, and working towards Level 2, we will use Marzano's 43 elements found in the model of instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are proven best practices with a high effect size to increase student achievement.

Marzano's model of instruction, the 43 elements, are proven strategies to increase student engagement and provide a structure for learning expectations.

**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.

8th Grade Science teachers will review their students' 5th grade science results to identify in which areas they were strong and weak at that grade level.

**Person Responsible:** Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** This action will take place within the first month of school.

8th Grade science teachers will analyze the students' 7th grade ELA informational text reading results. Using both this data and the 5th grade data, teachers will have a base line at which to start a plan of action. Teachers will also analyze the baseline, PMs, exemplars, and classroom informal and formal assessments. Weak and strong standards will be determined by class periods and by individual students to better build a focus on standards.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** Analysis will take place within three days of each mentioned exam so that a plan of action can be developed and implemented.

Our science teachers will use the district developed standards based slide shows.

**Person Responsible:** Maura Bennington (mauragb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Throughout the year as the presentations are made available.

**#2. 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.

Diplomat Middle is proud of the achievement reached by the 7th grade math students. There were 0% of students in the regular 7th grade math classes who were proficient, as only Levels 1 and 2 students were enrolled in that course. However, our math teachers of these classes were able to positively impact 28% of the 7th grade math students and they earned proficient scores within Levels 3-5 on the 2022-2023 Math FAST.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Diplomat Middle 7th grade math students will increase their proficiency rate from 28% to 35% as measured by the Math FAST, to be given in the spring of 2024. We have 126 incoming Levels 1 and 2 math students and therefore will increase 44 of those students to a Level 3 or higher.

**Monitoring:**

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

Assigned administrator and math team will monitor students' progress through:

Data analysis through Collaborative Teams on Tuesday mornings.

Bell work focused on identified high needs standards.

District Exemplars and analysis to assign work in needed standards.

Analysis of PM1 and PM2 and giving assignments focused on areas of need.

District created Instructional Guides.

**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.)

High Yield Strategies will be used in all math classes, i.e., writing to raise achievement, higher order thinking, distributed summarizing, text based evidence, short and long responses, close reads, and studio time. As a HRS Level 1 school, and working towards Level 2, we will use Marzano's 43 elements found in the model of instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are proven best practices with a high effect size to increase student achievement.

Marzano's model of instruction, the 43 elements, are proven strategies to increase student engagement and provides a structure for learning expectations.

**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. 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.

Our 6th and 7th grade student results have remained stagnant the last three years Sixth grade at 53% proficient, and 7th grade 47% proficient. For the last three years our 8th grade students' results have declined-- from 51%, to 50%, to most recently, 43%. Our overall proficient average is 48%. We must work effectively to increase the percent of proficient students on the ELA FAST.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Diplomat Middle students will increase their proficiency rate from an overall 48% to 55% as measured by the ELA FAST, to be given in the spring of 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

Assigned administrator, ELA, and Reading teams will monitor students' progress through:

Data analysis through Collaborative Teams on Tuesday mornings.

Bell work focused on identified high needs standards.

District Exemplars and analysis to assign work in needed standards.

Analysis of PM1 and PM2 and giving assignments focused on areas of need.

District created Instructional Guides.

**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.)

High Yield Strategies will be used in all ELA and Reading classes, i.e., writing to raise achievement, higher order thinking, distributed summarizing, text based evidence, short and long responses, and close reads. As a HRS Level 1 school, and working towards Level 2, we will use Marzano's 43 elements found in the model of instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are proven best practices with a high effect size to increase student achievement.

Marzano's model of instruction, the 43 elements, are proven strategies to increase student engagement and provides a structure for learning expectations.

**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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

##### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The proficiency of our ESE students is only 9% on the ELA FAST and 21% on the Math FAST. This is well below the state expectation of a 41% proficiency rate for ESE students on both exams.

##### **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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The proficiency of our ELL students is only 9% on the ELA FAST and 22% on the Math FAST. This is well below the state expectation of a 41% proficiency rate for ELL students on both exams.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

ELA FAST 9% Math FAST 22%

**Monitoring:**

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

qrtrly

**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***

**#6. 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.

Diplomat Middle is a PBIS school, We have a committee of teachers and staff who discuss and plan ways to acknowledge and reward all the wonderful students of our school. We recognize academic success for honor roll, growth for increasing results on baseline, PM1, iReady, Read180, and district exemplars every quarter, so we seek ways to recognize and reward students who demonstrate a strong work ethic and show progress toward their learning goals. Our goal is to continually decrease negative student behavior so we recognize positive behaviors and reward students twice a quarter. These are students who have received "kudos" in our Castle system from any staff members at DMS. We want include our quiet students, so we have a quarterly reward for students who do not have any discipline marks in FOCUS. We are implementing an attendance award this school year. We will over passes for 'no-collar' shirts, permission to wear slides, or giving students popcorn or popsicles during lunch. Attendance awards will be offered every 15-20 days to keep students interested and attending school. STUDENT OF THE MONTH: Each month teachers nominate students for SOM recognition. The nomination is based on our ROAR Expectations: R: respect self and others; O: on time, on task; A: A+ attitude; R: responsible for actions. Selected students are recognized with a certificate, non-collared shirt pass, and school news and newsletter feature. Students are motivated to be recognized and it promotes a culture of respect and kindness. TEACHER AND STAFF OF THE MONTH: Members of faculty are nominated by their peers for going above and beyond their daily duties. They are recognized for excellence, motivation, leadership, creativity, dedication, and communication within the building. The monthly winner receives a special parking spot, personalized tumbler and a certificate. Recognition occurs at a special breakfast meeting and is written up in our newsletter. GRADE LEVEL EVENTS: Each grade level hosts a Friday Fun Night. Students will no failing grades or discipline referrals are eligible to attend. PEACE program: Our Peace program is held in the month of October, in conjunction with anti-bullying month. As a school, we set a fundraising goal for a chosen charity in our community. A guest speaker is brought in for all students and sets the message for Peace. A variety of activities are held throughout the month, with a culminating activity at the end, to celebrate raising funds and overall participation.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our desired outcomes are to decrease discipline referrals in all three grade levels by at least 10%; increase attendance in each grade level to a daily average of at least 94%; to increase student achievement by 10% in each grade level for those earning A's, B's, and C's.

**Monitoring:**

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

Discipline will be monitored through our FOCUS program where all infractions are submitted and through our KUDOs from staff to students. Attendance will be monitored through weekly reports and reminders on the intercom and school news to stay in school for the specified 15-20 days. Student achievement will be monitored through grade reports, and results of the PMs, exemplars, interims, and report cards.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tanya Norris (tanyarn@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.)

PBIS is a researched based intervention proven to have an impact on attendance, discipline, and achievement.



**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

we have used PBIS for several years and see the difference it makes in our students. Paying attention to the positive is beneficial to our students, their peers, and our faculty.

**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.

Discipline reports completed and analyzed on a 15-20 day cycle.

**Person Responsible:** Tanya Norris (tanyarn@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Every 15-20 days throughout the school year.

Attendance reports completed and analyzed on a 15-20 day cycle.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Rucker (dawnlr@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Every 15-20 days throughout the school year.

Grade reports completed and analyzed each interim and report card date throughout the school year. Analyze the baseline data, PM1, PM2, quarterly exemplar data to determine who is to be recognized.

**Person Responsible:** Lauren Badger (laurenbad@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Data will be analyzed within three days of above listed events taking place.

**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 school funding. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student's needs. Initially, the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, and % of ESE students for academic support and 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. Principal supervisors provide ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups through monthly visits and data chats.

**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: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$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