

The School District of Lee County

Dunbar High School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Dunbar High School

3800 E EDISON AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>94%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>89%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burnside, Carl	Principal	
Diamond, Christine	Assistant Principal	
Hause, Toni	Assistant Principal	
Hendrick, Brandon	Assistant Principal	
Rose, Amanda	Assistant Principal	
Woods, Tamika	Assistant Principal	
Griffin, Catherine	Instructional Coach	Science Dept Chair
Stiffler, Donnie	Math Coach	
Spence, Denise	Instructional Technology	
Savage, Phillip	Instructional Coach	
McGhee, Vance	Teacher, K-12	
Duff, Pamela	Teacher, K-12	
Sanchez, Emily	Instructional Coach	
Artlies-Perez, Tania	Teacher, K-12	
Donnell, Shavon	Teacher, K-12	
Wright, Joscelynn	Teacher, K-12	
Woelke, Carol	Other	

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

118

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,776

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

18

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	471	466	411	428	1776
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	124	93	82	416
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	42	29	31	144
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	119	36	53	212
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	13	22	61
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160	175	128	168	631
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	213	141	124	641
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	162	210	143	157	672

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	2	9	25

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	458	417	450	413	1738
Attendance below 90 percent	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	30	43	49	25	147
Course failure in ELA	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	4	12	15	9	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	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

2020-21 - 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	458	417	450	413	1738
Attendance below 90 percent	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	30	43	49	25	147
Course failure in ELA	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	4	12	15	9	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				32%	55%	56%	35%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				40%	49%	51%	43%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	37%	42%	37%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				39%	50%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				47%	45%	48%	46%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	43%	45%	46%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				46%	62%	68%	44%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				55%	67%	73%	56%	66%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	33%	51%	-18%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	22%	48%	-26%	53%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

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	
2021						
2019	40%	56%	-16%	67%	-27%	

CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019						

HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	48%	64%	-16%	70%	-22%	

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	22%	59%	-37%	61%	-39%	

GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	50%	-13%	57%	-20%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	107/29.6	111/27.7	101/24.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/7.1	1/2.8	3/9.7
	English Language Learners	3/3.8	4/4.0	7/7.3
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	44/21.7	31/14.2	39/16.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	0/0	1/12.5
	English Language Learners	4/6.9	2/3.1	4/5.3
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Biology	All Students	31/64.6	49/83.1	45/78.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/100	2/100	1/50
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
US History	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	106/33	94/25.6	108/29.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3/9.7	2/5.6	2/5.0
	English Language Learners	2/3.4	4/5.5	4/5.9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44/21.7	31/14.2	39/16.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/6.9	0/0	1/12.5
	English Language Learners	4/6.9	2/3.1	4/5.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	30/17.9	81/38.4	60/31.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	8/12.7	19/24.4	12/15.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/50	2/100	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	93/28.9	92/31.3	130/41.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7/20	6/18.8	10/25.6
	English Language Learners	2/2.7	4/5.8	5/6.9

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/100	1/100	2/50
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	32	28	14	23	33	12	34		91	19
ELL	6	29	33	14	24	28	14	8		99	16
BLK	33	42	36	24	28	22	33	34		96	28
HSP	31	42	33	26	28	30	35	42		96	39
MUL	59	53		47	50						

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
WHT	59	52		51	38		64	89		98	70
FRL	30	38	32	24	26	24	33	41		96	35
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
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

During the 2020-21 school year the Grade 10, English Language Arts Learning Gains increased from 34% to 40% for all achievement levels. Overall Proficiency also increased in each of the achievement levels except level 2 students who decreased by 3%. Grade 9 English Language Arts Learning Gains increased from 45% to 46% for all achievement levels. Overall Proficiency also increased in all achievement levels.

The Mathematics Learning Gains for Algebra decreased in 2020-21 to 40% from 58%. Geometry Learning Gains decreased significantly from 45% to 26%. Proficiency decreased in all Achievement Levels for Algebra and Geometry. However the Proficiency for Level 1 Geometry students increased by 5%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2019 data, English Language Arts has the greatest need for Grade 10 Learning Gains as well as Proficiency. Mathematics greatest need for improvement is for Geometry Proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

In 2019 in English Language Arts, the teachers were not as experienced or demonstrated the expertise in the grade level standards. Restructuring of the department and professional development was provided and continue to be in place currently. This is also true for Geometry. Curriculum and assessment development has been a focus for both English Language Arts and Geometry.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The area showing the most improvement from 2019 to 2021 is English Language Arts, Grade 10 from 34% to 40%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors included: teacher professional development, collaboration during common planning, classroom support and modeling from Peer Collaborative Teachers, and restructuring of the department. New actions include, in-depth data analysis, restructuring of assessments to meet student deficiencies, as well as challenging all student to their highest potential by increasing participation in advanced placement classes (IB, AICE, AP, Honors).

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate student learning, after school tutoring is being established to support all students including those in Intensive classes up to and including students in the International Baccalaureate Program. An increased focus on student writing would support the ability to achieve higher performance. Monitoring of individual students to help increase success on understanding of standards and retention in all core classes is needed.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities would include International Baccalaureate training, Advanced International Certificate Education courses, as well as Advanced Placement. Additional opportunities are Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol and Advancement Via Individual Determination.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services include the development of a school leadership team focusing on data analysis and action plan from all contributing areas: Algebra, Geometry, Graduation Rate, English Language Arts, English Language Learners, Biology, and United States History. Model classroom observations to demonstrate best practices and build teacher capacity will also be implemented.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus	Currently there is a very low percentage of students achieving levels above grade level.
Description and Rationale:	There is also a low percentage of students enrolled in advanced classes including IB, AICE, and AP. Student absences is also significantly increased due to the recent pandemic.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-21 school year the enrollment in advanced classes will increase by 5%. Student engagement and proficiency will increase 3% due to the enrollment of more rigorous courses capturing student attention and a decrease in student absenteeism.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored with the addition of a second Social Worker allowing for more individual student attention on absenteeism. This will also be monitored by continued Professional Development and creation of the school Leadership Focus Accountability Collaboration Team. This team will meet monthly to analysis data and action plan.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carl Burnside (carlcb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	IB Approaches to Teaching and Learning as well as AICE, AVID, and SIOP strategies to enhance student engagement will be used.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Resources used in the IB Approaches to Teaching and Learning include Manage Back software and Turn It In Software, These programs will monitor student progress and success in both the IB program as well as other advanced placement classes. AICE professional development and resources to support the curriculum will be used to enhance student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

During 19-20 DHS ranked #198 out of 505 high schools statewide which is considered Low. There were 2.5 incidents per 100 students. The rate is less than the Statewide high school rate of 3.3 incidents per 100 students. The largest area of concern was the Violent Incidents at 1.91 per 100 students with a total of 36 incidents with 1887 students. This area has a Statewide rank of 412 out of 505 and a County rank of 14 out of 16. The largest reported area for Violent Incidents was Fighting.

The environment will be monitored through the use of Restorative Practices including Peer Mediation and Implantation of Positive Behavior Intervention Support. A PBIS team will be established and create a a plan to support the decrease in Violent Crimes. In addition a Dean of Discipline will be added to assist.

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.

There are multiple aspects of DHS that promote a positive school culture.

Each year, Dunbar High School (DHS) hosts a team building and informational camp for incoming freshman; this is referred to as Tiger Time. The goals of this event include:

1. Orienting students to the physical layout of campus
2. Identifying points of contact including administration, teacher leaders, coaches, sponsors, and so forth.
3. Discussing the Tiger Way of behaving and achieving at a high level which falls in line with the DHS motto of "achievement is the expectation!"

DHS also provides post-secondary planning through AVID and the counseling department. A multitude of clubs and organizations have been established including: Student Government, National Honor Society, JROTC, Club Elite for Girls, ArtClub, TSA (Technology), and Athletics to name a few.

We incorporate the district model of Wellness Wednesday schoolwide, with an adjusted bell schedule allowing for an additional period of time for this initiative. Additionally, the DHS counseling department presents in classrooms on the services they provide regarding social-emotional needs. They all have an open door policy for their students and run small groups on self-care and how student can reach out for assistance.

In addition, DHS will be participating in PBIS training. A PBIS committee will be created that will develop and help implement a schoolwide PBIS system.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Multiple teams work together to support the various initiatives at the school.

The administrative team oversees individual departments and grade levels. Department Chairs, Grade Level Sponsors, Clubs and Organizations are all sponsored by teachers and staff members. School counselors, the IB Coordinator, and Support Specialist also play a crucial role and contribute to the areas identified above.

In addition, this year DHS has added a second School Social Worker, a Dean of Students, and a full time

Mental Health Counselor. These individuals play a vital role in supporting students and are available every day to assist students with their daily needs.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00