Dunedin Highland Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Dunedin Highland Middle School

70 PATRICIA AVE, Dunedin, FL 34698

http://www.dunedin-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Dunedin Highland Middle School will establish a close working relationship with our neighboring community, demonstrating pride and respect for diverse cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, striving for 100% student success. We look to be a leader in cutting-edge technology, research-based learning strategies, and professionally developed educators.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dunedin Highland Middle School will close the achievement gap and open new learning opportunities to ensure that all of our scholars are prepared for college and career success by providing a safe and respectful environment, inspiring excellence in educational practices and student achievement, and demonstrating pride in our school community.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Glenn, Brandon	Principal	
Bernal, Joanna	Assistant Principal	
Henderson, Khristin	Assistant Principal	
McDonald, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Forsythe, Melissa	Math Coach	
Autrey, Rachel	Reading Coach	
Flannery, Kelly	Other	
Anderson, Melissa	Other	
Russell, Justin		
Bergstrom, Teresa	Other	
Emry, Michelle	Other	
Knight, Alyssa	Other	

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

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

All stakeholders were involved in creating the School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will be monitored monthly at PLC's.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	90%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) Pacific Islander Students (PAC)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems	

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	150	117	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	42	47	140
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	1	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	32	39	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	34	77	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	13	10	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	7	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	3	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	150	117	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	42	47	140
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	1	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	32	39	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	34	77	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	13	10	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	7	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	3	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	45	50	52	52	54
ELA Learning Gains	48	43	48	54	55	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	23	32	38	34	47	47
Math Achievement*	48	51	54	55	55	58
Math Learning Gains	47	52	58	54	52	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31	48	55	29	46	51
Science Achievement*	43	45	49	48	51	51
Social Studies Achievement*	60	64	71	60	68	72
Middle School Acceleration	69			88		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	35			32		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	25	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	23	Yes	3	3
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	52			
PAC	27	Yes	3	1
WHT	61			
FRL	33	Yes	3	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	48	48	23	48	47	31	43	60	69			35
SWD	18	30	22	23	39	35	15	43				23
ELL	18	28	22	24	28	23	10	31	29			35
AMI												
ASN	89	74		87	72		80	92	83			
BLK	20	28	17	17	25	24	12	34	31			
HSP	32	36	25	33	39	36	28	53	44			37
MUL	54	57	42	57	46	20	57	58	79			
PAC	31	38		25	14							
WHT	68	61	27	69	62	42	62	78	81			
FRL	29	36	22	29	35	29	22	44	43			40

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	53	50	29	52	47	33	47	57	80			36
SWD	20	31	29	29	38	30	38	28				24
ELL	26	39	31	32	36	40	20	49	67			36
AMI												
ASN	87	76		89	68		74	90	100			
BLK	25	28	17	18	31	30	20	29	29			
HSP	36	42	29	38	39	35	32	47	73			34
MUL	58	51	40	60	63		42	59	100			
PAC	53	69		57	54							
WHT	71	60	48	72	56	32	69	74	81			
FRL	34	40	30	30	32	28	23	40	56			33

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	52	54	34	55	54	29	48	60	88			32
SWD	33	53	44	32	46	37	35	26				30
ELL	24	48	40	32	33	27	12	28	62			32
AMI												
ASN	83	77		93	76		79	80	97			
BLK	20	34	25	24	37	20	15	25	71			
HSP	35	45	42	43	44	31	28	51	84			32
MUL	52	52	29	45	42	25	43	40	88			
PAC	27	27		36	45							
WHT	73	66	38	74	67	45	72	86	89			
FRL	33	44	35	36	41	28	28	45	71			30

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	59%	48%	11%	47%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	47%	9%	47%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	47%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	36%	5%	48%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	44%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	53%	40%	50%	43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	46%	54%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	68%	0%	66%	2%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

For the 22-23 school year our ELA data showed the lowest performance. This was due to teacher attendance issues and the students entering already below the state's proficiency level. Teacher buy in also contributed to this as well. The curriculum pacing guide was a lot for teachers to create more student interest.

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 prior school year was our 7th grade math. We declined from 55% to 41% in 7th grade math. This was due to having out 7th grade accelerated students take the 8th grade FAST assessment.

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.

For all the graded cells Dunedin Highland Middle School was higher than the state average for proficiency.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was our 8th grade math data. We increased from 9% proficiency to 64% proficiency. We intentionally placed students in the proper course to support students' growth and learning. We also tested our accelerated students on the 8th grade assessment.

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

We have 194 students enrolled that have two or more early warning systems.

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

Teachers will have Intentional and meaningful PLC's.
Teachers will have clear and learning objectives.
Teachers will implement Intentional small group instruction.
Teachers will have differentiation and scaffolding of material to meet the needs of all students.
Teachers will have student engaging in collaborative strategies.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our goal for the coming year centers on better preparing our teachers to ensure every student is receiving the quality education necessary to move on to the next grade level with the tools needed to be successful. Our focus will be on improving both our overall proficiency percentage as well as the percent of our students demonstrating increased aptitude compared to the year previous by ensuring our teachers receive multiple instances of professional development related to identifying critical content so students are aware of what they are learning and why and teachers are focused on teaching to the depth of the standard, differentiating instruction so each student is getting the support they need, and engaging in collaborative structures so they are able to use the content they are taught beyond the walls of the classroom.

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

Our current level of performance is that 54% of our students are reaching proficiency in ELA, as evidenced in the 2023 FAST ELA. We expect our performance level to be 58% proficient in progress monitoring 1, 2, and 3.

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

Each week teachers will review classroom data and common plan in their content PLC's. During planning teachers will plan for differentiation and scaffolding with an emphasis on small groups and collaborative structures. Teacher will receive focused Professional Development on each area. Additionally, they will be asked to use the professional development they receive during at least one lesson during the week, which will be monitored by an administrator using walkthroughs, then bring back both reflections and work samples to the next PLC so they can discuss what worked, what didn't, what new they would like to try, and how they can continue to improve their practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin McDonald (mcdonaldke@pcsb.org)

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

1. Standards based planning using data driven decision.
2. Differentiating and Scaffolding to meet the needs of all learners with an emphasis on small group instruction.
3. Using and implementing Collaborative Structures in the classroom.

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

Using student data to include 504, ESE, ELL and assessment data, standards based planning can occur to meet student needs. In the the classroom, small groups allow teachers to differentiate and scaffold as needed while collaborative structures keep students engaged.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Clear learning objectives

Person Responsible: Kevin McDonald (mcdonaldke@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Intentional and meaningful Professional Learning Committees.

Person Responsible: Kevin McDonald (mcdonaldke@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Focused Professional Development

Person Responsible: Kevin McDonald (mcdonaldke@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our goal for the coming year centers on better preparing our teachers to ensure every student is receiving the quality education necessary to move on to the next grade level with the tools needed to be successful. Our focus will be on improving both our overall proficiency percentage as well as the percent of our students demonstrating increased aptitude compared to the year previous by ensuring our teachers receive multiple instances of professional development related to identifying critical content so students are aware of what they are learning and why and teachers are focused on teaching to the depth of the standard, differentiating instruction so each student is getting the support they need, and engaging in collaborative structures so they are able to use the content they are taught beyond the walls of the classroom.

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

Our current level of performance is that 65% of our students are reaching proficiency in Math, as evidenced in the 2023 FAST Math. We expect our performance level to be 67% proficient in progress monitoring 1, 2, and 3.

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

Each week teachers will review classroom data and common plan in their content PLC's. During planning teachers will plan for differentiation and scaffolding with an emphasis on small groups and collaborative structures. Teacher will receive focused Professional Development on each area. Additionally, they will be asked to use the professional development they receive during at least one lesson during the week, which will be monitored by an administrator using walkthroughs, then bring back both reflections and work samples to the next PLC so they can discuss what worked, what didn't, what new they would like to try, and how they can continue to improve their practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

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

1. Standards based planning using data driven decision.
2. Differentiating and Scaffolding to meet the needs of all learners with an emphasis on small group instruction.
3. Using and implementing Collaborative Structures in the classroom.

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

Using student data to include 504, ESE, ELL and assessment data, standards based planning can occur to meet student needs. In the the classroom, small groups allow teachers to differentiate and scaffold as needed while collaborative structures keep students engaged.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Clear learning objectives

Person Responsible: Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Meaningful and intentional Professional Learning Committees.

Person Responsible: Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Focused Professional Development

Person Responsible: Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our goal for the coming year centers on better preparing our teachers to ensure every student is receiving the quality education necessary to move on to the next grade level with the tools needed to be successful. Our focus will be on improving both our overall proficiency percentage as well as the percent of our students demonstrating increased aptitude compared to the year previous by ensuring our teachers receive multiple instances of professional development related to identifying critical content so students are aware of what they are learning and why and teachers are focused on teaching to the depth of the standard, differentiating instruction so each student is getting the support they need, and engaging in collaborative structures so they are able to use the content they are taught beyond the walls of the classroom.

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

Our current level of performance is that 52% of our students are reaching proficiency in Science, as evidenced in the 2023 SSA. We expect our performance level to be 55% on the 2024 SSA,

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

Each week teachers will review classroom data and common plan in their content PLC's. During planning teachers will plan for differentiation and scaffolding with an emphasis on small groups and collaborative structures. Teacher will receive focused Professional Development on each area. Additionally, they will be asked to use the professional development they receive during at least one lesson during the week, which will be monitored by an administrator using walkthroughs, then bring back both reflections and work samples to the next PLC so they can discuss what worked, what didn't, what new they would like to try, and how they can continue to improve their practice.
Student performance on GAP and cycle assessments for all grades Science will demonstrate our progress towards these goals. These assessments will also be used as reflection points to determine areas for improvement within these three areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

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

1. Standards based planning using data driven decision.
2. Differentiating and Scaffolding to meet the needs of all learners with an emphasis on small group instruction.
3. Using and implementing Collaborative Structures in the classroom.

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

Using student data to include 504, ESE, ELL and assessment data, standards based planning can occur to meet student needs. In the the classroom, small groups allow teachers to differentiate and scaffold as needed while collaborative structures keep students engaged.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Clear learning objectives

Person Responsible: Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Meaningful and intentional Professional Development

Person Responsible: Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Focused Professional Development

Person Responsible: Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our goal for the coming year centers on better preparing our teachers to ensure every student is receiving the quality education necessary to move on to the next grade level with the tools needed to be successful. Our focus will be on improving both our overall proficiency percentage as well as the percent of our students demonstrating increased aptitude compared to the year previous by ensuring our teachers receive multiple instances of professional development related to identifying critical content so students are aware of what they are learning and why and teachers are focused on teaching to the depth of the standard, differentiating instruction so each student is getting the support they need, and engaging in collaborative structures so they are able to use the content they are taught beyond the walls of the classroom.

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

Our current level of performance is that 69% of our students are reaching proficiency in Civics, as evidenced in the 2023 Civics EOC. We expect our performance level to be 78% proficient in cycle assessments for all Social Studies classes to include World History, US History and Pre-AP.

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

Each week teachers will review classroom data and common plan in their content PLC's. During planning teachers will plan for differentiation and scaffolding with an emphasis on small groups and collaborative structures. Teacher will receive focused Professional Development on each area. Additionally, they will be asked to use the professional development they receive during at least one lesson during the week, which will be monitored by an administrator using walkthroughs, then bring back both reflections and work samples to the next PLC so they can discuss what worked, what didn't, what new they would like to try, and how they can continue to improve their practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Khristin Henderson (hendersonkh@pcsb.org)

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

1. Standards based planning using data driven decision.
2. Differentiating and Scaffolding to meet the needs of all learners with an emphasis on small group instruction.
3. Using and implementing Collaborative Structures in the classroom.

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

Using student data to include 504, ESE, ELL and assessment data, standards based planning can occur to meet student needs. In the the classroom, small groups allow teachers to differentiate and scaffold as needed while collaborative structures keep students engaged.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Clear learning objectives

Person Responsible: Khristin Henderson (hendersonkh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Meaningful and intentional Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible: Khristin Henderson (hendersonkh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Focused Professional Development

Person Responsible: Khristin Henderson (hendersonkh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

DHMS 2022-2023 school year discipline data by subgroups shows that African American students are 2.5 more times likely to receive a referral than their peers. 40% of our discipline referrals are made up of African American students which leads to 60% of our African American students with an out of school suspension which impacts academic achievement.

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

DHMS would like to decrease the 40% of referrals by African American students to 35% of the referrals by African American Students, which also correlates to the decrease of out of school suspension from 60% to 55%.

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

We will monitor it through SBLT and MTSS which will be held discussed monthly. During this time, we will look at referral incidents, locations, and disciplinary actions. We will also problem solve the issues. We will also monitor the risk ratio as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Kelly Flannery (flanneryk@pcsb.org)

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

Culturally responsive professional development and targeted professional development based on our data discussions.

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

Based off our student data students our African American students interact more with the disciplinary system more than any other subgroup evidence-based practices suggest that the use of culturally responsive teaching strategies reduces disproportionality.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

School Improvement Plan one pager will be provided to parents during summer bootcamps, meet the teacher and back to school night. In addition, it will be available at every PTA/SAC meeting.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Dunedin Highland Middle School has convened a committee, known as the Learning Lab, whose purpose is
to address disciplinary disproportionalities that have existed at the school and devise a culturally responsive
PBIS system that meets the needs of all learners and stakeholders at DHMS, The Learning Lab consists of
teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and community members that represent all of the racial, ethnic, and exceptional subgroups within our school. The culturally responsive PBIS system includes: a refined discipline system, clear expectations for home-school communication, positive behavior rewards and interventions, a refined MTSS data tracking system, student leadership development, restorative practices, schoolwide expectations lessons for each quarter, weekly community circles, and on campus mentoring.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Dunedin Highland Middle School plans to strengthen its academic program by increasing engagement in the classroom through collaborative structures and meeting the needs of all learners through differentiation and scaffolding.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

This year we are implementing. trauma informed practices and classroom belonging practices. Our counselors will ensure that we are working pulling counseling groups and also having restorative circles. Students will also have counseling.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We will monitor student in our MTSS/RTI process. We have also started to implement our schoolwide tier 1 procedures which aligns to our REP. Students who are not successful with our schoolwide expectations will receive additional interventions and support.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Our professional development will be tailored around walkthrough data that aligns to our schoolwide look fors to improve classroom instruction. We will have professional developmemt for all staff members to meet the needs of our students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A