Pinellas County Schools

Dunedin High School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dunedin High School

1651 PINEHURST RD, Dunedin, FL 34698

http://www.dhs.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Kyle Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: B 2013-14: C
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

100% Student Success

Provide the school's vision statement

The mission of Dunedin High School is to prepare students for post-secondary opportunities while assisting students to develop Integrity, Respect and Social Responsibility.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title
Johnson, Kyle	Principal
Principal	
Kiblinger, James	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Davis, Stephanie	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Warner , Matthew	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Settle , Christopher	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	56%	56%	44%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	51%	51%	47%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	43%	42%	39%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	32%	45%	51%	39%	46%	51%
Math Learning Gains	32%	44%	48%	39%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	41%	45%	37%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	49%	64%	68%	60%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	71%	73%	74%	72%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
09	2019	49%	54%	-5%	55%	-6%
	2018	42%	53%	-11%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	37%	53%	-16%	53%	-16%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	47%	62%	-15%	67%	-20%
2018	55%	63%	-8%	65%	-10%
Compare		-8%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	77%	70%	7%	70%	7%
2018	72%	70%	2%	68%	4%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	25%	55%	-30%	61%	-36%
2018	26%	57%	-31%	62%	-36%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	34%	56%	-22%	57%	-23%
2018	48%	56%	-8%	56%	-8%
Compare		-14%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	38	34	32	42	12	36	41		85	32
ELL	16	38	41	17	34	28	22	48			
ASN	53	38		44	40					100	92
BLK	21	42	35	12	17	25	32	63		95	58
HSP	36	48	54	30	38	28	38	63		91	63
MUL	52	63		31	33		53	75		92	64
WHT	50	46	35	39	32	25	59	88		94	61
FRL	33	46	42	24	30	28	38	68		94	55

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	34	38	27	36	32	41	45		83	30
ELL	5	49	49	7	28	53	17	9		64	
ASN	53	50		69							
BLK	16	28	27	7	11	12	38	66		78	34
HSP	29	44	37	26	35	45	40	70		85	62
MUL	52	58		48	47		64			95	44
WHT	57	52	48	50	48	42	72	77		91	58
FRL	33	43	37	32	35	38	48	64		79	43

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	61
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Biology an ELA 10. Our ELA scores on Achievement dropped by 1 Percent from last year. Our general population also reflected this drop with a 1 percent drop in learning gains. Our L-25's did go up because of our improved staff alignment and county lead monthly PLC's.

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

Biology, ELA 10 and Geometry.
For Geometry we replaced a superior teacher with a first year teacher.
For ELA 10 we have a re-alignment of staffing
For Biology

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

ELA 10 lost -16 percent this year over last year. We had to put some new personnel into ELA 10 along with spreading it out among a number of different teachers.

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

Social Studies. We placed the teachers rooms in the same area to improve communication between the teachers. We also had only the teachers with the best results from prior years teaching the class.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

ELL and Black students not making sufficient progress.

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

1. Improving the performance of our ELL students
2. Improving the performance of our Black students
3. Improving the number of Biology students passing the EOC.

4. Improving the number students passing the ELA EOC
5. Improving the number of students passing the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA/Reading Goal
Rationale	The 2019 student results for the ELA FSA EOC were well below the state average and regressed from the previous year. The 2019 achievement score dropped from a 44 percent to a 43 percent. Our overall learning gains for ELA FSA EOC dropped from a 47 percent to a 46 percent.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal for this year's grade 9 ELA FSA scores will improve from a 49 percent to a 54 percent. Our grade 10 ELA FSA scores will improve from a 37 percent - 47 percent. Both are goals are obtainable will move us into the "B" range.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Kiblinger (kiblingerj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers have common planning and PLC’s to create standards-based lessons. Site based planning will take place by course level meetings. County personnel will meet at least once a month on curriculum coverage and our quarterly assessment analysis. Progress reports will distributed twice a quarter with after-school tutoring and Saturday school opportunities available in these core areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Instructional standards coverage and planning is key with our common ELA course level PLC's. Targets will be set for each of our assessments dates. County input on our curriculum prep and data analysis review with the month. This will keep the standard's coverage and delivery constant with the county level, building level and grade level expectations.
Action Step	
Description	1. ELA teachers will have common planning and PLC’s to create Common standards-based lessons for each course level. 2. Professional development is provided to analyze data to identify areas for differentiation and remediation. 3. Teachers will meet in PLC’s to align rigorous standards-based lessons with the DHS cross-curricular blueprint to work with our other departments. 4. Pull-outs with our L-25 population will be done with grades 9th - 12th. This will be for reinforcement for the ELA FSA-EOC standards 9th grade through 12th grade as students get close to their ELA FSA-EOC testing windows. 5. Progress reports will be distributed twice in each quarter to keep teachers, students, parents and administration informed of student success and/or needs. 6. Instructional tutoring will be offered weekly after school and on Saturday's, of progress report weeks, in each of the core areas for remediation.
Person Responsible	James Kiblinger (kiblingerj@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Mathematics Goal
Rationale	Algebra 1 scores dropped from 25 to 24, and Geometry tumbled from 51 to 34.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase Mathematics FSA-EOC by 3 points. (FSA EOC proficiency from 32 to 35, Learning Gains from 32 to 35, and L25's from 26 to 29) Increase Mathematics students Learning Gains by 3 points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Settle (settlec@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize data from standards-based instruction and cycle assessments to identify student strengths and weaknesses, and organize them to interact with content through differentiated instruction and scaffolding. Through Professional Development from district math coaches, focus on strategies that engage students through standards-based instruction and complex tasks. (AVID, collaborative groups, RP, best practices, etc.) Identify critical content from within the standards in alignment with district resources by utilizing PLC's and other collaborative groups among staff within their departments and courses taught.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By working with district coaches, and using selections from best practices, strategies were selected from resources with standards based lesson plans. By using cycle assessment data, staff can correlate student data to predict student success on math FSA EOC's. Data is used to assist teachers with data chats with students with the focus on monitoring for remediation and differentiated instruction.
Action Step	
Description	1. FSA EOC and course-taught centered PLC's will meet, at least, bimonthly with the focus on standards based lesson planning, collaborative instruction and best practices, assessments, monitoring data and pacing, ESSA subgroup progress, and L25 learning gains. 2. Common planning periods are for PLC's and collaboration where teachers can facilitate progress monitoring of standards-based instruction, monitoring ESSA subgroup progress, and focus on learning gains progression of L25's. 3. In monitoring learning goals and proficiency, teachers will use data monitoring to track student progress, and record their monitoring with the use of district data chat forms during data chats with students. 4. Monitor parental contact of students with a D or an F through a parent contact log, focusing on ESSA subgroups and L25's. 5. Expectation to participate in professional development. 6. Facilitate the use of L25 "pull-outs" where targeted, predetermined, groups of up to 6 students are "pulled-out" of elective courses to meet with teachers or co-teachers to do tutoring, differentiated instruction, data chats, and overall student support. The focus will be on learning gains of L25s.

Person Responsible	Christopher Settle (settlec@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science Goal
Rationale	Biology EOC scores dropped 11 points. The subgroup data shows pass rates of 17% for ELL, Hispanic 40%, and black 38%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students passing the Biology FSA will increase from 49 to 64, as measured by Spring 2019 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matthew Warner (warnerma@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase PD from district science coaches focusing on strategies to engage students in complex tasks Utilize data (cycle assessments) to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student (target subgroups) Enhance staff capacity (PLC's) to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies where selected in collaboration with the district science coach as best practices from around the district. These strategies are resource rich with standards based lesson plans that are plentiful and easily accessible. The use of cycle assessment data has shown a correlation to predict a students success on biology EOC. Materials to help students complete data chats based off cycle assessment and help teachers identify standards to focus on and monitor for remediation is available in several formats that helps with differentiation.
Action Step	
Description	1. Bimonthly Bio PLC meeting with AP and Science coach required focus: subgroups progress, creating common lesson plans, assessments, and monitoring for use of pacing guides 2. Optional bimonthly science PD on campus 2. Common planning period to facilitate progress monitoring of standards mastered and subgroup progress 3. All biology classes will take Cycle 3 assessment 4. Have student data chats on all cycle assessments completed on district data chat forms 5. Submit parent contact log for D and F students at end of every three weeks.
Person Responsible	Matthew Warner (warnerma@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	ESSA Black Students Goals
Rationale	The Black Students at Dunedin High School missed the 41 percent threshold by one percent.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 16 percent to 26 percent, as measured by the 2018 School Profile Report
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kyle Johnson (johnsonky@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for black students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The district bridging the gap plan indicates professional development in education with equity as a vehicle to improving the success rate of black students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Ensure that all black students who show potential to succeed in an AP or Dual Enrollment course are scheduled into an appropriate course and provided supports 2. Support teachers by providing professional development on building relationships and sharing student data with black families 3. Implement effective intervention strategies based on the close monitoring of students with personalized learning plans 4. Invite all black students that are behind in credits and/or have not passed EOC’s required for graduation to participate in the ELP program
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#5	
Title	ELL Goal
Rationale	ELL achievement in English/Language Arts was at 16 percent and learning gains were at 38 percent. Mathematics achievement was at 17 percent, overall learning gains was at 34 percent, and learning gains for lower 25th percentile was at 28 percent. Science achievement was at 22 percent.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of ELL students achieving proficiency in ELA will increase from 3 to 10, as measured by 2018 School Profile Report.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Kiblinger (kiblingerj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to strategically plan and implement lessons which meet the needs of English learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because there is a need to refocus on the needs of students from other cultures through restorative practices and student centered learning
Action Step	
Description	1. Professional development related to teaching and engaging students through student-centered lessons with rigor 2. Data chats incorporated into lesson planning focusing on ESE students. 3. Create a schedule for your ESOL Bilingual Assistants that directly supports standards-based instruction for ELs; provide appropriate PD first. Reach out to ESOL Office for support and resources.
Person Responsible	James Kiblinger (kiblingerj@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Graduation/Acceleration/Certification
Rationale	We still have a small percentage of students that are not graduating in four years. We also are not at the state average for all students earning college credit by passing their AP tests.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Work to ensure the numbers of students Graduating increases 1 percent. Work to ensure that the number of students earning College credit for AP and DE classes or earning an industry certification increases 3 %
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Kiblinger (kiblingerj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use the AP potential report to ensure that all students that have the ability are placed in AP or DE courses. Send teachers teaching courses where students can earn industry certifications to PD designed to help them help the students achieve higher rates of passing the certification tests. Offer more tutoring and ELP sessions through out the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Tutoring has made a difference in the past for all level of students. ELP has computer based credit recovery classes. Industry Certifications when taught by instructors that have certifications have higher pass rates by their students.
Action Step	
Description	1. ELP -APEX sessions for students to recover failed classes 2. Tutoring sessions held at the same time as APEX. 3. PD for teachers to earn industry certifications
Person Responsible	Stephanie Davis (davisste@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	ESE Goal
Rationale	The Students with Disabilities scored less than 41% proficient.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We are going to raise the L-25 students with disabilities making learning gains in Math from 12 percent to 22 percent. We are going to raise the percentage of students with disabilities achieving proficiency in ELA from 20 percent to 30 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Davis (davisste@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will be using the Co-teaching and support facilitation models to ensure the students with disabilities are receiving all the accommodations they are due as stated in their IEPS.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students learn best in mainstream classes and by using so-teachers and support facilitation teachers we can accommodate more students with disabilities and give them better support than using other models.
Action Step	
Description	1. ESE teacher will ensure the accommodations for each student with a disability in the class are known by both teachers and followed. 2. Data chats incorporated into lesson planning focusing on ESE students. 3. ESE teacher will attend PLCs for the department in which the ESE teacher services to ensure the curriculum plan meets the needs of the ESE students. 4. ESE teacher will collaborate with the general education teacher to ensure methods such as collaborative team teaching, small group, or station teaching and any other teaching strategies that will be helpful to ESE students is incorporated in the lesson plan 5. ESE co-teachers will be present in each co-teach classroom for the duration of the period 6. ESE associates will be assigned to students according to IEP needs to provide support to students who need one-on-one assistance.
Person Responsible	Stephanie Davis (davisste@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Social Studies
Rationale	Current student performance is above state and district level. Continue to improve the level of proficiency for Social Studies Students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase EOC proficiency from 79% to 85%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Davis (davisste@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers have common planning and PLC's to create standards-based lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Development from district Social Studies coaches, focus on strategies that engage students through standards-based instruction and complex tasks. (AVID, collaborative groups, RP, best practices, etc.) Identify critical content from within the standards in alignment with district resources by utilizing PLC's and other collaborative groups among staff within their departments and courses taught.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers received professional development around collaboration and accountable talk strategies that can be implemented and modified to meet the needs of diverse learners. 2. Teachers include AVID strategies into daily lesson pans that support students at all levels 3. Teachers regularly incorporate knowledge checks (formative assessments) and use the collected data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the core content 4. Teachers meet in monthly PLC's to review 5. Teachers conduct frequent data chats with student of offer support for student achievement and indicidualzed goal setting. 6. Use of focused note taking
Person Responsible	Stephanie Davis (davisste@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

.

Part V: Budget

1	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: ELA/Reading Goal**	**$0.00**

2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Mathematics Goal**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science Goal**	**$0.00**
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Black Students Goals**	**$0.00**
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: ELL Goal**	**$0.00**
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Graduation/Acceleration/Certification**	**$0.00**
7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: ESE Goal**	**$0.00**
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Social Studies**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**