

The School District of Lee County

Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School

4750 WINKLER AVENUE EXT, Fort Myers, FL 33966

<http://dun.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Karen Prentice

Start Date for this Principal: 10/26/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School

4750 WINKLER AVENUE EXT, Fort Myers, FL 33966

<http://dun.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The School District of Lee County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together We SOAR!

Spirit - Optimism - Achievement - Respect

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shaker, Nathan	Principal	
Eckhardt, Trent	Assistant Principal	
Paul, Tia	Teacher, K-12	
George, Suja	Teacher, K-12	
Landau, Brian	Teacher, K-12	
Colvin, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	
Ramos, Virginia	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/26/2020, Karen Prentice

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	327	325	330	0	0	0	0	982	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	22	27	0	0	0	0	79	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	12	0	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	2	2	0	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	2	6	0	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	66	64	0	0	0	0	194	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	57	67	0	0	0	0	176	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	47	57	0	0	0	0	158	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/26/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	359	329	334	0	0	0	0	1022	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	23	21	0	0	0	0	55	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	16	8	0	0	0	0	39	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	5	0	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	83	80	0	0	0	0	234	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	62	64	0	0	0	0	188	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	19	23	0	0	0	0	68
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	359	329	334	0	0	0	0	1022
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	23	21	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	16	8	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	5	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	83	80	0	0	0	0	234

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	62	64	0	0	0	0	188

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	19	23	0	0	0	0	68
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	55%	54%	51%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	54%	58%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	44%	47%	45%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	63%	64%	58%	55%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	62%	64%	57%	62%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	54%	51%	45%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	50%	51%	52%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	70%	72%	67%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	54%	52%	2%	54%	0%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	51%	-6%	52%	-7%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	51%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
08	2019	50%	57%	-7%	56%	-6%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	40%	47%	-7%	55%	-15%
	2018	29%	41%	-12%	52%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	57%	-8%	54%	-5%
	2018	57%	65%	-8%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
08	2019	54%	60%	-6%	46%	8%
	2018	52%	47%	5%	45%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	46%	46%	0%	48%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	48%	-3%	50%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	67%	3%	71%	-1%
2018	67%	66%	1%	71%	-4%
Compare		3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	59%	40%	61%	38%
2018	96%	60%	36%	62%	34%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	50%	50%	57%	43%
2018	100%	53%	47%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	33	31	24	37	35	30	35			
ELL	29	50	54	47	56	53	20	46	70		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	78	67		97	86		92	92	94		
BLK	32	43	40	41	48	36	32	62	65		
HSP	52	57	51	65	64	53	48	71	77		
MUL	73	56		77	58		77		83		
WHT	75	67	56	83	77	72	71	88	89		
FRL	39	49	46	51	54	43	40	63	73		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	41	42	25	50	50	22	39			
ELL	21	51	47	43	64	71	18	55			
ASN	90	77		88	83		83	100	100		
BLK	35	47	41	39	53	54	33	58	68		
HSP	51	58	45	58	68	66	41	65	65		
MUL	74	70		75	83			93			
WHT	79	67	42	80	74	74	70	91	87		
FRL	45	53	43	50	61	61	39	66	70		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	45	38	17	40	37	21	38			
ELL	18	45	43	34	60	50	38	40			
ASN	90	82		97	79			100	94		
BLK	34	46	41	36	51	42	31	60	61		
HSP	48	56	47	53	64	47	49	61	60		
MUL	54	63		65	63						
WHT	76	75	62	76	74	62	80	78	83		
FRL	41	52	44	45	57	42	39	60	64		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 Math L25 learning gains went down 13% from the previous year. We have been trending up since 2015. This is a significant area of concern, given the relative stability of some of our other areas.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is 7th grade Math learning gains which were down 8% from last year.

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 Algebra 1 EOC pass rate was a 100% compared to the 88% state average. Strong acceleration programs within our Math department contributed to this success.

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

6th grade Math showed the greatest improvement going from 29% proficiency to 40% proficiency. Restructured our 6th grade classes and developed an intervention system that met the needs of our L25 students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One area of concern is the number of level 1 Math students; the number increased significantly from 210 to 234. All other areas saw a decrease in numbers from the previous year.

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

1. 7th Grade Math learning games
2. ELA 8th grade proficiency and learning gains
3. ELA 7th grade proficiency and learning gains
4. Attendance - 8th Grade Students
5. Addressing the needs of our Level 1 students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD will be an area of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY20.

Measurable Outcome: SWD performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for low performing ESSA subgroup students at our school. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible: Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Behavior and student engagement in instruction are closely tied.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of student KUDOS awarded to students, from teachers, from 3524 (3.5 for each 1 student) to 4000 (4 for each 1 student) by May 2021.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Evidence shows the effectiveness of specific positive feedback in limiting, or eliminating, negative behaviors.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

For two years we have steadily increased "KUDOS", and our referral and OSS percentages have declined at a similar rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Set the goal as one of our Priority Goals for the year.
2. Monitor quarterly; communicate progress to students AND staff on a quarterly basis.
3. Each admin will personally issue 5 KUDOS a week to students and 3 to teachers, as a gentle reminder.

Person Responsible Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

PLDMS has only one area of concern regarding ESSA expectations - ESE student proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: ESE student proficiency in ELA will increase from 21% to 31%, to meet ESSA expectations.

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

ESE students traditionally scheduled into smaller, less inclusive classes, have been fully included in all academic classes this year.

**Rationale for Evidence-
based Strategy:**

Evidence indicates that inclusion promotes student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master schedule was developed to pair "rotation" classes with Gen Ed counterparts.
2. ESE teachers will co-teach with paired Gen-Ed teachers to merge classes.
3. Students will be taught by content-area teacher and supported by ESE teacher.
4. Data will be monitored by a PLC formed exclusively to track and support TS&I students.
5. All students are double blocked into ELA and separate from reading intervention and supports.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PLDMS has only one area of concern regarding ESSA expectations - ESE student proficiency.
---	---

Measurable Outcome:	ESE student proficiency in ELA will increase from 24% to 34%, to meet ESSA expectations.
----------------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
---	---------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE students traditionally scheduled into smaller, less inclusive classes, have been fully included in all academic classes this year.
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence indicates that inclusion promotes student achievement.
---	---

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master schedule was developed to pair "rotation" classes with Gen Ed counterparts.
2. ESE teachers will co-teach with paired Gen-Ed teachers to merge classes.
3. Students will be taught by content-area teacher and supported by ESE teacher.
4. Data will be monitored by a PLC formed exclusively to track and support TS&I students.

Person Responsible	Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)
---------------------------	--

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Our ESSA ESE group is our primary focus. Implementing iReady and new strategies implemented by our Reading Coach should have a direct effect on L25 and Special Needs reading.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls

below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$330,809.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6300		0161 - Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School	IDEA	1.0	\$70,837.00
<i>Notes: Jennifer Kuehl, Behavior Specialist</i>						
	6300		0161 - Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School	General Fund	1.0	\$70,837.00
<i>Notes: Montana Howarth, Intervention Support Specialist</i>						
	5200		0161 - Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School	General Fund	2.67	\$189,135.00
<i>Notes: 6 ESE Paraprofessionals</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline				\$70,837.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6300		0161 - Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School	General Fund		\$70,837.00
<i>Notes: Montana Howarth, Intervention Support Specialist</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$9,083.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000		0161 - Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School	Other		\$9,083.00
<i>Notes: SAI - Summer Extended Program</i>						

Total:	\$410,729.00
--------	--------------