Bonita Springs High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Bonita Springs High School

25592 IMPERIAL PKWY, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

http://bnh.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.

Embody a culture of excellence through high-quality instruction, social and academic development of students, and collaboration with families and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educate, engage, enrich, and inspire all students to be future ready.

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
Estes, Jeff	Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal - Evaluate data to help make school-based decisions. - Participate in leadership team meetings to discuss issues and concerns. - Conduct classroom walk-throughs and formal/informal evaluations to evaluate instructional practices - Provide a safe environment for teachers and students to work at a high level. - Hold faculty meetings to inform, train, and discuss faculty and staff concerns. - Support assigned PLC teams Reading Coach - Assist in promoting literacy through all content areas (cross-curricular) - Support teachers through modeling, discussion, and data analysis. School Counselors - Ensure students are scheduled into correct courses. - Meet with students to discuss graduation status and career path options. - Communicate with parents and teachers on how a student is progressing in his/her education. - Provide input on the master schedule. Department Heads - Lead weekly PLC meetings with your department. - Ensure information gathered at leadership meetings is communicated to team members. - Support department in helping them get necessary items ordered. - Work with your assigned administrator in ordering the necessary items (e.g. textbooks, materials, supplies). - Communicate information from your department to the Principal or Assitant Principals if an issue arises. College/Career Specialist - College planning and Application Coordinator/Coach. - Work with students on setting up their Bright Futures accounts. - Setup College/Career Signing Days. - Meet with seniors to discuss post-secondary options, resume building, and interview skills.
Bredenkamp, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal - Evaluate data to help make school-based decisions. - Participate in leadership team meetings to discuss issues and concerns. - Conduct classroom walk-throughs and formal/informal evaluations to evaluate instructional practices - Provide a safe environment for teachers and students to work at a

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		high level. - Hold faculty meetings to inform, train, and discuss faculty and staff concerns. - Support assigned PLC teams
Aldrich, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal - Evaluate data to help make school-based decisions. - Participate in leadership team meetings to discuss issues and concerns. - Conduct classroom walk-throughs and formal/informal evaluations to evaluate instructional practices - Provide a safe environment for teachers and students to work at a high level. - Hold faculty meetings to inform, train, and discuss faculty and staff concerns. - Support assigned PLC teams
Mason, Leah	Administrative Support	
Lauber, Robert	School Counselor	School Counselors - Ensure students are scheduled into correct courses. - Meet with students to discuss graduation status and career path options. - Communicate with parents and teachers on how a student is progressing in his/her education. - Provide input on the master schedule.
Brito, Kristin	Graduation Coach	College/Career Specialist - College planning and Application Coordinator/Coach. - Work with students on setting up their Bright Futures accounts. - Setup College/Career Signing Days. - Meet with seniors to discuss post-secondary options, resume building, and interview skills.
Ifcher, Loren	Reading Coach	Reading Coach - Assist in promoting literacy through all content areas (cross-curricular) - Support teachers through modeling, discussion, and data analysis.

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

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

A copy of the SIP is presented to the SAC committee, which consists of school staff, members of the leadership team, parents, businesses, and SGA students. The SAC committee reviews the SIP and its goals and offers input. The SAC committee then votes to approve the SIP goals.

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))

SIP goals were made based on preliminary 22-23 data. After each progress monitoring the school leadership team and teachers of tested subject areas will review the data and compare it to the goals. Adjustments and interventions will be used if needed based on the data. Monitoring of interventions will be a collaborative approach between school leadership and department heads of tested subject areas.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	33	47	50	52	49	51	50		
ELA Learning Gains				45			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			31		
Math Achievement*	40	34	38	35	33	38	35		
Math Learning Gains				40			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			13		
Science Achievement*	63	54	64	49	35	40	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	58	66	65	40	48	64		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	93	84	89	96	49	61			
College and Career Acceleration	59	65	65	72	60	67			
ELP Progress	40	36	45	16			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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	96

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	30	Yes	4	4
ELL	27	Yes	4	3
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK				
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	70			
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	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	28	Yes	3	2
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK				
HSP	43			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	45			

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	33			40			63	62		93	59	40
SWD	13			13			24	23		6	7	29
ELL	3			13			29	21		16	7	40
AMI												
ASN	75			80							2	
BLK												
HSP	23			31			52	52		50	7	41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46			53			79	76		68	6	
FRL	24			31			51	54		48	7	39

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	52	45	27	35	40	45	49	65		96	72	16
SWD	15	27	20	5	25	43	21	25		100	47	10
ELL	13	23	20	12	32	38	15	30		82	25	16
AMI												
ASN	75	60						67		100	70	
BLK												
HSP	41	38	29	26	35	43	41	55		93	61	16
MUL	80	69		73								
PAC												
WHT	66	53	20	53	49	48	66	76		100	91	
FRL	43	42	35	26	32	41	44	50		99	70	12

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	42	31	35	19	13	57	64				44
SWD	7	33	35	12	12	8	7	14				27
ELL	7	24	24	12	17	15	15	21				44
AMI												
ASN	71	58		53	33		75	70				
BLK	55	45										
HSP	37	37	31	23	16	12	39	54				43
MUL	79	46										
PAC												
WHT	65	48	38	51	23	20	74	77				
FRL	37	34	29	21	12	5	42	53				46

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	46%	45%	1%	50%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	52%	46%	6%	48%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	44%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	39%	-20%	50%	-31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	43%	6%	48%	1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	63%	-7%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	54%	1%	63%	-8%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Based on our preliminary data for 22-23, Math showed the lowest performance of 45% proficiency, although it was a 10% increase from the 21-22 school year.

Although Math was the lowest-performing area, it had a huge increase in proficiency. The increase in proficiency can be contributed to the implementation of Algebra 1A/1B, which provided an additional period of math support. The Math department also began to track individual student mastery of standards more closely and at a deeper level. The math department provided after-school tutoring for struggling students. Teachers incorporated spiral review and drill-down practice in class and through the use of bellringers. Individual class goals were set to help support the overall math proficiency goal.

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

The area showing the greatest decline was Social Studies with a 4% decrease. The 21-22 school year had 65% proficiency, but the preliminary 22-23 data is showing 61% proficiency. One contributing factor may be the lack of experienced teachers in our Social Studies department. Classroom walkthroughs and observations show a need for coaching in this area. We also had one vacancy with a substitute teacher for a period of time. When the new teacher was hired he had to catch up on weeks/months of missed instruction.

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.

Looking at the 21-22 school data, Math was the area that had the largest proficiency gap compared to the state average. The state average for Math proficiency was 53%, but our 21-22 Math proficiency was 35%, which is an 18% difference; however, our preliminary 22-23 data is showing 45% proficiency, thus bringing us closer in range to the state average.

The large gap in proficiency is due to the COVID years. This time period really impacted our students, teachers, and community members with specific restrictions in place. Virtual student learning really impacted the opportunity for teachers to provide the needed support only a classroom setting can bring.

Although Math has the largest gap, they are on a positive trend and closing the proficiency gap. One possible factor for the increase in proficiency could be the implementation of a 7-period day. Last year we switched from block scheduling to a 7-period day. Seeing the students every day as well as the implementation of Algebra 1A/1B allowed our teachers to provide additional support and instruction for struggling learners on a daily basis.

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

Based on our 23-24 preliminary data, Science is the area that showed the most improvement from 21-22. In 21-22, the Science achievement level was 49%, but the 22-23 preliminary data is indicating 63% proficiency, which is a gain of 14%.

The Science department began to track individual student mastery of standards more closely. They created individual class goals for proficiency to help them reach their overall proficiency goal. A spiral review of missed standards was incorporated into bellringers. Teachers incorporated drill-down practice for missed standards that are covered on the EOC. After-school tutoring sessions were provided to students who needed additional support or instruction. Lastly, the Biology teachers held an EOC review at the end of the course covering tested topics/standards.

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

N/A - no early EWS data

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

1. Continue to increase Math proficiency
2. Increase ELA proficiency
3. Increase College and Career Acceleration
4. Increase graduation rate

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to 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.

In 2022, Bonita Springs High School was identified as TSI due to performing below the Federal Index of 41% in two categories. One of those categories idetified was our English Language Learner population. Our ELL students scored a Federal Index of 28 and was below the 41% threshhold for the third consecutive year.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, we will increase our Federal Index for our ELL students from 28% to 42% by increasing 9th and 10th grade ELA proficiency.

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

We will utilize our "Pathway to an A" staff website to track the results of the vaious progress monitoring assessments given throughout the year. The teachers will track the student's results, drill down to the standards that they are struggling to perform proficiently, and set class-based goals for the students to strive for. Then the teachers will utilize vaious interventions to support the student's progress. Administration will monitor the teacher, department, and school-wide goals for each progress monitoring exam result.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

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

Teachers will place an emphasis on grade-level and higher order thinking questions to increase reading comprehension.

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

Leveled questioning is critical for building comprehension skills and is one of the strategies most likely to improve a student's reading comprehension.

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.

Teachers will use PLC time to focus on developing higher order thinking questions.

Person Responsible: Michelle Aldrich (michellerb@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Admin will ustilize classroom walk-through tools to check that leveled questioning is being utilized in lessons.

Person Responsible: Michelle Aldrich (michellerb@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#2. 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.

In 2022, Bonita Springs High School was identified as TSI due to performing below the Federal Index of 41% in two categories. One of those categories idetified was our Student with Disabilities population. Our SWD students scored a Federal Index of 31 and was below the 41% threshhold for the third consecutive year.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, we will increase our Federal Index for our SWD students from 31% to 42% by increasing 9th and 10th grade ELA proficiency.

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

We will utilize our "Pathway to an A" staff website to track the results of the vaious progress monitoring assessments given throughout the year. The teachers will track the student's results, drill down to the standards that they are struggling to perform proficiently, and set class-based goals for the students to strive for. Then the teachers will utilize vaious interventions to support the student's progress. Administration will monitor the teacher, department, and school-wide goals for each progress monitoring exam result.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

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

Teachers will place an emphasis on grade-level and higher order thinking questions to increase reading comprehension.

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

Leveled questioning is critical for building comprehension skills and is one of the strategies most likely to improve a student's reading comprehension.

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.

Teachers will use PLC time to focus on developing higher order thinking questions.

Person Responsible: Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Admin will ustilize classroom walk-through tools to check that leveled questioning is being utilized in lessons.

Person Responsible: Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#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.

Overall, teacher retention has been a positive area for Bonita Springs High School throught the years. Unfortunately, at the end of the 22-23 school year, we had 12 teachers leave our school. Of those 12, only 2 of them left for lateral positions within the district. The other 10 left for a number of reasons, including but not limited to, more pay from neighboring districts, more pay from private schools, or leaving eduation all together.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, we will have less than 8 teachers leave our school.

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

This will be monitored using staff attendance records and informal conversations with teachers throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

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

The APPLEs program for new teachers will be utilized. This program pairs new teachers with a mentor to do informal observations and help guide them to success. The SDLC has a new teacher orientation that is utilized at the beginning of the year where they learn cooperative learning stratigies and make connections with other educators. ALL teachers receive coaching and support through classroom walk-throughs and PLC time with thier respective departments.

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

It is imperative that all teachers feel supported. In addition, many new teachers are career changers who need extra help and guidance to support them as they transition into the classroom.

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.

The new teachers are signed up for the new teacher orientation provided by SDLC when they are hired over the summer.

Person Responsible: Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

By When: The beginning of the school year.

The new teachers are paired with their APPLES mentor.

Person Responsible: Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

By When: The beginning of the school year.

Classroom walkthroughs are completed on ALL teachers throughout the year to provide feedback and support on classroom instruction.

Person Responsible: Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

ALL teachers are assigned a PLC with an Assistant Principal to oversee and monitor professional progress and to address any concerns.

Person Responsible: Jeff Estes (jeffreybe@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

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.