

The School District of Lee County

Dunbar High 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

Dunbar High School

3800 E EDISON AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

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

Demographics

Principal: Carl Burnside

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2000

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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

Dunbar High School

3800 E EDISON AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://dhs.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)
High School 9-12	Yes	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

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

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.

Dunbar High School will develop inquiring, knowledgeable, and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect, compassionate leadership, and lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dunbar High School will graduate students who contribute ethically, productively, and responsibly to their community and their environment.

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
Burnside, Carl	Principal	
Hause, Toni	Assistant Principal	
Walker, Forrest	Assistant Principal	
Klausing, Jill	Teacher, K-12	
Griffin, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Mario	Teacher, K-12	
Spence, Denise	Teacher, K-12	
Rosa, Deedra	Teacher, K-12	
Merette, Maurel	Teacher, K-12	
Diamond, Christine	Assistant Principal	
Woods, Tamika	Assistant Principal	
Stiffler, Donnie	Teacher, K-12	
Rose, Amanda	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2000, Carl Burnside

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.*

1

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

87

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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	0	0	0	0	458	417	450	413	1738
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	49	55	58	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	43	49	25	147
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	61	38	28	128
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	15	9	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	133	153	158	629
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	104	73	187	522

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	0	0	0	0	154	118	109	158	539

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	12	16	42	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	32%	55%	56%	37%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	49%	51%	42%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	37%	42%	27%	37%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	39%	50%	51%	31%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	47%	45%	48%	35%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	43%	45%	34%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	46%	62%	68%	46%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	55%	67%	73%	44%	63%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
09	2019	33%	51%	-18%	55%	-22%
	2018	27%	51%	-24%	53%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	22%	48%	-26%	53%	-31%
	2018	33%	50%	-17%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	56%	-16%	67%	-27%
2018	36%	61%	-25%	65%	-29%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	64%	-16%	70%	-22%
2018	50%	62%	-12%	68%	-18%
Compare		-2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	22%	59%	-37%	61%	-39%
2018	23%	60%	-37%	62%	-39%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	50%	-13%	57%	-20%
2018	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
Compare		-2%			

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	15	33	28	18	30	24	27	33		91	17
ELL	5	25	24	18	40	33	23	24		53	26
BLK	20	35	31	27	37	24	30	42		92	19
HSP	30	38	29	39	46	34	49	56		73	38
MUL	65	50		58	90		60				
WHT	67	60		69	67		79	84		93	62
FRL	26	38	32	37	46	32	43	51		84	32
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	18	38	33	20	34	43	20	41		69	22

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
ELL	5	33	30	9	51	62	13	9		53	55
BLK	26	38	34	30	38	36	35	44		80	26
HSP	35	43	37	39	50	57	48	54		74	54
MUL	33	36		46	27		50			92	27
WHT	57	54		60	55		60	79		77	52
FRL	31	41	38	36	45	46	41	51		78	39
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	13	26	24	13	18	23	36	29		63	21
ELL	6	24	24	10	30	34	22	18		52	56
BLK	22	39	33	21	30	33	33	38		74	22
HSP	38	39	24	32	35	35	45	36		72	40
MUL	40	30		23	20						
WHT	61	59		51	46	47	74	81		81	60
FRL	31	39	28	27	31	33	36	41		73	31

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	28

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	65
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	73
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	42
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.

No state testing was completed in the 2019-2020 school year, so we are using the 2018-19 information. The lowest performing data component from the 2018-19 school year was bottom quartile learning gains in English Language Arts. All of our lowest quartile in 10th grade were taught by a weak teacher who was assigned to us from the alternative school. She was placed there due to the departure of a teacher at the last minute and the other option was going on maternity leave with a high risk pregnancy. That teacher will not be assigned to 9th or 10th grade. In addition, anticipating the shortfall, the 9th and 10th grade PLC's analyzed their formative data beginning in April and have made changes to instruction in order to enhance student performance with a better intervention plan.

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 from the 2017-18 school year to the 2018-19 school year was bottom quartile learning gains in Mathematics. The drop was from 46% to 33% for a decline of 13%. The biggest contributing factor to this was the lack of learning gains made amongst English Language Learners in the bottom quartile.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was English Language Arts Achievement with a gap of 24%. This gap was 21% a year ago and 16% two years ago. The Grade 10 performance in particular was low as were the ESSA subgroups of SWD and ELL.

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

The data component with the greatest improvement graduation rate which improved by 5 percent. We greatly expanded our ACT/SAT tutoring to assist students with earning a concordant score for the ELA graduation requirement and placed a particular focus on ELLs.

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

The primary area of concern continues to be preparing students for the ELA FSA requirement for graduation. This is not just for students who are below grade level but also increasing the performance and literacy of higher level students.

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

1. Work extensively on improving the performance of the ELL students in ELA and Math.
2. Continue the work of the Peer Collaboration Teachers with coaching other teachers to improve instruction.
3. Place a stronger emphasis on improving the rigor for the upper level students especially in STEM to increase their critical thinking by having them prepare for outside competitions which will enhance them being prepared for the global competition.
4. Continue the professional development of teachers with instructional strategies such as Google Suites, SIOP, AVID, IB and Kagan
5. Have PLC's continue to fine tune the curriculum development of building internal assessments and curriculum supports.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

This area showed a 7% drop from 37% to 30% from the 2017-18 school year to the 2018-19 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

Dunbar High School will continue with the lowest 25% learning gains; will use comparison data between the 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 FSA ELA test results; increase from 30-40%; improve by 10 points (from 30% to 40%) in ELA lowest 25% learning gains as measured by the Spring 2021 administration of the FSA ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Diamond (christinemdi@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Dunbar High School English teachers will implement high-yield instructional strategies such as distributed summarizing and writing to raise achievement with an overall focus on higher order thinking questioning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

These strategies are a focus across the district and our staff has received training on them. Each PLC will work to ensure proper implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Pre-school training staffwide on high-yield instructional strategies
2. PLCs planning for implementation (collaborative lesson planning)
3. Peer Collaborative Teacher (PCT) modeling
4. Administration observing and providing coaching
5. Monthly administrative meetings to review progress

Person Responsible

Christine Diamond (christinemdi@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of

Focus

Description and

Rationale:

This area showed a 13% drop from 46% to 33% from the 2017-18 school year to the 2018-19 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

Dunbar High School will continue with the lowest 25% learning gains; will use comparison data between the 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 FSA Math EOC test results; increase from 33-48% improve by 15 points (from 33% to 48%) in Math lowest 25% learning gains as measured by the Spring 2021 administration of the FSA Math EOCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Diamond (christinemdi@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Dunbar High School Math teachers will implement high-yield instructional strategies such as distributed summarizing and numbered head / collaborative pairs with an overall focus on higher order thinking questioning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

These strategies are a focus across the district and our staff has received training on them. Each PLC will work to ensure proper implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Pre-school training staffwide on high-yield instructional strategies
2. PLCs planning for implementation (collaborative lesson planning)
3. Peer Collaborative Teacher (PCT) modeling
4. Administration observing and providing coaching
5. Monthly administrative meetings to review progress

Person Responsible

Christine Diamond (christinemdi@leeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black/African American students will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY19.

Measurable Outcome: All ESSA subgroup performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carl Burnside (carlcb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for ELL, SWD, and Black/African American students at Dunbar High 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: Carl Burnside (carlcb@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

During the 2020-2021 school year, Dunbar High School will increase the percentage of teachers from 75% to 95% that are proficient in the online platform Google Suites which increases differentiation within online and face-to-face instruction.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00