

The School District of Lee County

# Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# 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: 1/8/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

## 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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	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	75%

### School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Eckhardt, Trent	Principal	Oversee budget, hiring, personnel issues, major safety or discipline incidents. Also, be the main communicator with the community and district personnel. Help train and manage Assistant Principal's with discipline, building, and scheduling.
hepler, heidi	Assistant Principal	Oversee and create schedule. Work with teachers, parents, and students to provide the best community service while placing the students in appropriate classes. Maintain fidelity in district and data policies. Help with discipline on a daily basis. Work with testing coordinator to plan a calendar for district and state mandated tests.
Woods, Winston	Assistant Principal	Oversee all discipline and building procedures. Will work with Restorative Justice coordinator to set up consistent plan of consequences while following the district Code of Conduct. Prepare any administrative hearings that may be needed. Map out all safety procedures in the school. Work with building supervisor and custodial staff to keep up with district cleaning protocols. Head up busing personnel.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 1/8/2020, 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.*

4

**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.*

18

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

65

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

998

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

13

**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	319	335	344	0	0	0	0	998
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	36	64	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	24	37	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	9	13	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	8	25	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	74	102	0	0	0	0	259
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	67	94	0	0	0	0	241
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	87	64	102	0	0	0	0	253

**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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	7

**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	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 retainers:**

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

**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	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

## 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				52%	55%	54%	55%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	56%	54%	57%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	44%	47%	43%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				63%	64%	58%	59%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains				62%	64%	57%	65%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	54%	51%	61%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				52%	50%	51%	47%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	70%	72%	71%	69%	72%

### 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
06	2021					
	2019	54%	52%	2%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	40%	47%	-7%	55%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
08	2021					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	46%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	46%	46%	0%	48%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	70%	67%	3%	71%	-1%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	59%	40%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	50%	50%	57%	43%

### 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 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61/29.6	71/32.3	80/35.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/7.1	2/6.1	2/6.1
	English Language Learners	1/3.7	2/7.1	3/10
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	111/36.4	140/44.7	161/50.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/9.4	3/9.1	6/18.2
	English Language Learners	3/10.7	3/10	4/13.3



Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	157/57.1	172/58.3	183/59.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/6.1	8/21.6
	English Language Learners	3/12.5	8/36.4	8/28.6
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	143/53.2	168/56.2	115/51.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/10	2/6.5
	English Language Learners	3/10.7	6/19.4	6/19.4
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	105/44.1	123/41	145/52.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	2/6.9	4/14.8
	English Language Learners	4/16.7	3/10	6/22.2

## 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	18	30	22	17	25	23	19	20			
ELL	23	40	38	24	41	60	25	37	50		
ASN	94	74		91	75		92	94	100		
BLK	38	38	17	34	31	34	29	39	58		
HSP	41	44	38	45	44	48	46	45	79		
MUL	37	53		68	59						
WHT	75	64	22	77	60	52	86	85	89		
FRL	39	39	22	39	37	38	37	45	63		
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		

### 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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	499
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	38
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	89
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
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	68
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	39
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?

Pre-Algebra moves with what students are in the class. This has an effect on 6th grade and 7th grade math levels depending on where they are placed. In 2019, 6th graders were placed in Pre-Algebra so the proficiency level was very high at 54%. In 2021, Pre-Algebra was only level 1 and 2 8th graders, dropping the proficiency level to 28%. This year, 7th graders are placed in the class which will now naturally move the 7th grade level down and the Pre-Algebra proficiency back up. The growth in ELA is going to be very important as our Level 3 students in 6th and 7th grade reading have increased dramatically over the last two years. The 7th grade Level 3 students struggled during the "pandemic year" and it showed in the testing.

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

Seeing growth in our basic level 1, 2, and 3 math has been increasingly more difficult in the past couple of years. 6th and 7th grade math stayed in the 40% growth area and the Pre-Algebra group was at 28% last year. This will change as our district placements have changed this year. We will have more level 3 students in the "hybrid" class, which will naturally lead to a higher percentage of students at grade level. The 7th grade math will be more difficult to move as it will be predominately level 1 and 2 students.

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

Lack of face-to-face instruction during the pandemic and students starting halfway through the year caused scores to go down across the board. Additionally, the loss of Title I monies created a hardship. Some students lost their credit and are sitting in an online class taking a second math class to move on to the next grade level while filling gaps in math standards. To address these issues, we had to carefully schedule these students, ask our teachers to work with these students by offering morning tutoring, give them extra math classes when needed, and assign peer tutors to work with the students.

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

The science and 8th grade ELA scores improved dramatically from two years ago. The ELA proficiency levels improved from 50% to 57%, which was our biggest jump of any area in the school. The science data was our biggest surprise, with a movement from 46% to 51% proficiency.

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

The 8th grade ELA team works closely together on drilling down these students from year to year. The science teachers used "study island" as a separate resource for students to review the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade science standards. Those teachers believe that this should be mandated across the board to help them with their classroom instruction.

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

The level of rigor in teaching the standards being taught and modeled in the classroom will positively accelerate learning. We started the year with district Kagan trainings to really use effective methods in teaching the standards. We will continue to provide professional development and use our strongest teachers to help others with modeling and by conducting observations and classroom walkthroughs, which will then be used to improve instruction and accelerate learning.

#### **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.**

We've already used district trainers during pre-school week to go over specific classroom techniques. Teachers have put out videos of what they are doing to help out others in the school. iReady trainings have been consistently followed and teachers are using the different areas that help them understand what math or reading standards that the students are lacking. Administrators will continue walk-throughs and look for effective methods for the increased level of student engagement activities.

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

Effectively leveled scheduling using data and teacher input. Past teacher input is crucial in placing students academically, behaviorally, and what type of effort that student should be putting in. Effective PLC's are used not to just talk about what is going on, but to increase effectiveness in the classroom. Communication is crucial in keeping everyone up to date on new ways of thinking and effective ways to teach the new types of students. Also, the mental health issues need to be talked about and students need to be aware of how societal issues are effecting how they react in school and beyond.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

#### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	With a new team working together, our meetings and work need to really focus on how we manage the teachers with a positive approach but also keeping them all accountable of their methods and work ethic on a daily basis. As teachers get complacent, so do the students. As an administrative team, we need to focus on classroom management and desired outcomes and expectations.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	In keeping with the district's lead, we are also focusing on teacher attendance. Teacher absenteeism negatively impacts student learning. Also, substitutes in the classroom do not have the ability to accelerate learning. To positively affect student learning, it is our goal to reduce teacher absenteeism by 10% during the course of the year. We will use United Way gift cards as incentives to celebrate those with the least absences during a specific quarter of the year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Teacher absenteeism can be monitored by our school office manager. A baseline score for each student on a standardized measurement tool will be established during the first quarter. Each teacher's students will be measured for growth each quarter. These growth statistics will be compared to the teacher's personal attendance rate. We believe that teachers with low absenteeism rates will have students with the highest scores on a standardized measurement tool.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Trent Eckhardt (trenthe@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Empirical evidence has shown that teacher attendance has a direct relationship not only on student test scores but also on student absences, student suspension rates, and non cognitive skills. By incentivizing teacher attendance and by asking teachers to set attendance goals, it is believed that student scores will increase and student absenteeism and suspensions will decrease.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has determined that teachers are the most important factor in school-based inputs into student learning. Realizing this and acknowledging the work by Michael Hansen and Diana Quintero from The Herman and George R. Brown Chair- Governance Studies, we have determined that this one factor will have the biggest positive impact on student achievement in our school.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Collect teacher absenteeism data from last year (or first quarter for new-to-school teachers).
2. Present data to each teacher and ask each to set a positive goal (goals should reflect a reduction in days absent by no less than 10%).
3. Collect baseline iReady reading and math scores for each student in each teacher's class.
4. On a set date (towards the end of the year), compare the students' fourth quarter scores with their first quarter scores.
5. Determine which teachers have met and/or exceeded their goals.
6. Compare scores with teacher absenteeism rates.

**Person Responsible** heidi hepler (heidih@leeschools.net)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Due to the pandemic, our discipline progression from the last two years is skewed, so we will focus on the last full school year- 2018-2019- and work to reduce the number of outside school suspensions. It is our belief that students who are away from face-to-face instruction for any length of time are seeing a backwards slide in retention and in education.

**Measurable Outcome:** For FY '21-'22 we will strive for a 10% reduction in outside school suspensions (OSS) compared to the last full school year- 2018-2019.

**Monitoring:** Our OSS will be monitored weekly by our intervention support specialist.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Winston Woods (winstonw@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Evidence has shown that students who are home do not gain valuable instruction and see a marked decrease in . Additionally, we will follow a specific set of alternatives to suspension including PBIS, restorative practices, mediations, and use of our intervention room (Phoenix program) and believe these interventions will have a favorable effect on student growth and learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We have noted an increase in students seeking additional instructional help from the Phoenix coordinator and also seeking to improve their academic standing after receiving school-based interventions rather than OSS. Again, students do not gain positive educational gains while serving OSS.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Receive referral
2. Start with the lowest possible intervention as punishment.
3. If this is not successful, move to the next step on the hierarchy.

**Person Responsible:** Winston Woods (winstonw@leeschools.net)

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Through focused examination initiated by the district and with the help of our school ESE department, we identified significant gaps in our programming for students with disabilities. Because of these gaps, our students were not receiving all of the interventions needed to make them successful. Data reviewed for this group included high-stakes test scores, student grades, failure rates, IEP requirements (contact minutes required, etc.), and discipline data for our students with disabilities (SWD).
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our SWD students will show a positive increase on high-stakes tests and a marked decrease in discipline referrals.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The FOCUS platform will be the main source of discipline data for SWD. End-of-the-year test scores will be gathered to determine the outcome for SWD for this focus area.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Trent Eckhardt (trenthe@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Providing added interventions (learning lab, tutoring, peer facilitators, co-teachers, etc.) will have a positive correlation to student achievement and reduction of discipline referrals.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Typically, our lowest 25% students are made up of most of our SWD students. If we can offer interventions that positively improve these students' education, we believe we will see an improvement in student scores and a reduction in discipline issues. All of this will improve our school scores and data.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Create a viable learning lab for ESE and 504 students.
2. Staff this lab with a certified ESE teacher.
3. Create a co-teacher schedule that allows them to work in classrooms and meet student minute requirements.
4. Set up a peer facilitator program that matches high-achieving, service-minded students with students that need additional help and support.
5. Encourage teachers to set up before-school time to meet with students for additional help.

**Person Responsible** heidi hepler (heidih@leeschools.net)

**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.

**Although the "Violent Incident" data looks low from 2019-20 at 1.77 per 100 students, that number increased last year with an increase of Peer Conflicts/Physical Altercations after the students returned from online schooling. We are already monitoring and comparing how the students are reacting to mediation to avoid conflict. Our Assistant Principal of Discipline and Restorative Justice Coordinator are communicating with staff on a daily basis to assist with any conflicts that may have started at home, on social media, or in school. We have an administrative hearing with every conflict to get parents involved before it escalates in our outside of the school.**

#### **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.**

We start by following our SOAR rules (Spirit, Optimism, Achievement, Respect) and have them posted all over the school. We review rules, policies, and expectations with class meetings, announcements, Zoom meetings, and others...These rules are addressed in the hallways, classrooms, cafeteria, bus ramp, etc...We use the PLDMS Happenings to communicate with families on activities in the school or policies that need to be enforced at home. We use quarterly "celebrations" with positive reinforcements such as dances (before COVID), festivals, treats, and prizes throughout the school. We have fun "dress down" weeks to have students celebrate their time in the school. We use Restorative Justice and mediation to have students solve peer conflicts before they escalate. We continuously use common language with the students so they are trained to solve issues in a maturation process during their 3 years at school.

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

Principal, Assistant Principals, Behavioral Specialist, Restorative Justice Coordinator, Security Specialists, School Counselors, Alternative to Suspension Coordinator, Front Office Personnel, Building Supervisor and daytime custodians, all instructional personnel, paraprofessionals, and bus drivers all have a part in building a positive culture and environment in the school. Then parents and community leaders are involved in supporting our staff in building and maintaining that culture in the school. After coming back from the pandemic, the entire culture had a huge change as students came back and had to be "re-trained" on what

school is supposed to be. This comes from the top-down, and must be consistently followed by all that want PLDMS to be a leader in the district.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00