The School District of Palm Beach County

Dwight D. Eisenhower K 8

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 18

Positive Culture & Environment 23

Budget to Support Goals 24

Dwight D. Eisenhower K 8

2926 LONE PINE RD, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

https://ddee.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Debbie Battles

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Palm Beach County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 18

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 24

Dwight D. Eisenhower K 8

2926 LONE PINE RD, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

https://ddee.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	70%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary's mission is to create a collaborative, safe, respectful learning environment which nurtures students to take responsibility for their learning; all staff members as they work to develop their craft and support students; parents/caregivers as they raise their children to adulthood; and the community which supports and upholds the values of our school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Eisenhower staff, parents/caregivers, and community will work as a team to teach children in a way that promotes academic success, social-emotional development, and life-long learning while recognizing the diversity of children’s needs and abilities.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Battles, Debbie	Principal	The Principal provides leadership and administration, which motivates instructional and support personnel to strive for superior performance so as to provide the best possible opportunities for student growth and development, both educationally and personally. She is also responsible for overseeing the writing, training, and implementation of the SIP process. This includes continually evaluating existing programs and practices, curriculum content, and all programs. She maintains an educational philosophy and school climate which encourages a cooperative and participating attitude on the part of all staff and students while maintaining a standard of student behavior designed to empower the student for self-control and minimize school and classroom interruptions..
Salvatore-Fuller, Teresa	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Responsible for working with teachers and staff throughout the process of writing and implementing the SIP plan. Provide instructional support by facilitating PLCs, conducting professional development, and modeling effective strategies for teachers to implement high yield strategies that facilitate meeting our goals.
Pierce, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Science Resource Teacher, Responsible for working with teachers and staff throughout the process of writing and implementing the SIP plan. Provide instructional science support by modeling effective strategies for teachers to implement high yield strategies that facilitate meeting our goals as well as sharing resouce materials.
Marchica, Christian	Administrative Support	CIT/Leadership Team member, Responsible for overseeing the writing, training, and implementation of the SIP process. Provide instructional and social-emotional support for teachers, conducting professional development, and modeling effective strategies for teachers to implement high yield strategies that facilitate meeting our goals.
Fitzpatrick, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Coach, Responsible for working with teachers and staff throughout the process of writing and implementing the SIP plan. Provide instructional support by facilitating PLCs, conducting professional development, and modeling effective strategies for teachers to implement high yield strategies that facilitate meeting our goals.
East, Jill	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Coach, Responsible for working with teachers and staff throughout the process of writing and implementing the SIP plan. Provide instructional support by facilitating PLCs, conducting professional development, and modeling effective strategies for teachers to implement high yield strategies that facilitate meeting our goals.
Jacobs, Maureen	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, she assists the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		management of the school's programs and operation. She assist the principal in developing and maintaining an effective educational programs, which maintains the school culture as a results-oriented collaborative learning community. She assist the principal in the overall administration of the school; She is responsible for overseeing the writing, training, and implementation of the SIP process, and supports the principal in the collaborative development, implementation, and ongoing refinement of the SIP.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/10/2016, Debbie Battles

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students

	White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	57	65	67	62	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	20	9	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	5	22	24	23	6	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Course failure in Math	2	7	20	15	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	26	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	16	30	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
FY21 ELA Midyear Diagnostic Data	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FY21 Math Midyear Diagnostic Data	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	2	10	20	16	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	1	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/22/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	62	66	62	74	64	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	5	8	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	26	29	25	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	19	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	3	5	5	17	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	62	66	62	74	64	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	5	8	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	26	29	25	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	19	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	3	5	5	17	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	58%	57%	52%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	63%	58%	53%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	56%	53%	29%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	68%	63%	68%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	68%	62%	70%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	59%	51%	52%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	51%	53%	59%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	52%	54%	-2%	58%	-6%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	62%	-6%	58%	-2%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	64%	59%	5%	56%	8%
	2018	55%	59%	-4%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	52%	65%	-13%	62%	-10%
	2018	63%	63%	0%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	67%	-6%	64%	-3%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	89%	65%	24%	60%	29%
	2018	72%	66%	6%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	56%	51%	5%	53%	3%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	35	71	64	45	71	64	46				
ELL	36	80		50	74		30				
BLK	43	49	18	61	76	55	43				
HSP	57	70		64	79		53				
WHT	70	63		70	83		64				
FRL	50	58	46	60	76	64	53				

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	50	62		63	62		38				
ELL	26	47	50	32	76	80					
ASN	100			90							
BLK	44	60	46	65	70	64	25				
HSP	63	70	50	63	68	70	47				
WHT	63	53		73	61		80				
FRL	56	66	57	64	69	65	43				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	30	39	23	63	65		40				
ELL	27	36	30	52	68	50	38				
ASN	69	62		88	85						
BLK	33	37	29	48	48	38	38				
HSP	48	54	36	67	66	50	42				
WHT	61	61		80	88		80				
FRL	42	49	32	64	66	48	51				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
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	59
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.

Using the FY19 FSA data when examining our subgroup data across all FSA assessment areas, our percentages indicate our Black students were lowest performing with 18% ELA learning gains in the lowest 25%. Subgroup achievement data also indicates that Students With Disabilities had the lowest ELA achievement at 35%, but one of the highest gains at 71% overall and the highest gain of all subgroups for the lowest 25%, where 64% of students showed a gain.

Comparing our FY20 ELA Winter Diagnostic subgroup scores to our FSA FY19 ELA subgroup scores, our Students With Disabilities,White, and Black subgroups performed better on the FY20 Winter Diagnostic than the FY19 FSA. However, the lowest performing subgroup was Hispanic with a decrease of 11.2% on the FY20 Winter Diagnostic from the FY19 FSA.

Comparing our FY20 Math Winter Diagnostic subgroup scores to our FSA FY19 Math subgroup scores, our Students With Disabilities performed better on the FY20 Winter Diagnostic than the FY19 FSA. However, the White, Black, and Hispanic subgroups performed lower on the FY20 Winter Diagnostic from the FY19 FSA, with the Hispanic subgroup performing the lowest with a decrease of 7.8%.

Comparing our FY20 Science Winter Diagnostic proficient score to our FY19 Winter Diagnostic proficient score, we had a dramatic decrease of 20.18%.

An analysis over time shows no consistent patterns or trends over time in any particular test or subgroup.

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

Using the FY19 FSA data, ELA Learning Gains for Black decreased 28% for the lowest 25%. Because we have a small school population, which gives us small subgroups, data has indicated that even a small fluctuation in the students adding or withdrawing from our population can lead to large swings in our results.

Comparing our FY20 Winter Diagnostic subgroup scores to our FSA FY19 subgroup scores, our Hispanic students declined on both our ELA and Math scores.

Comparing our FY20 Winter Diagnostics to our FY19 Winter Diagnostics, our science scores declined by 20%. Our fifth grade science teacher was on a Leave of Absence and an interim substitute was in the classroom until mid-October. In mid-October, the regular classroom teacher returned, but she was new to teaching science, especially at the fifth grade level.

Comparing the FY20 Winter Diagnostics to our FY19 Winter Diagnostics, year-to-year, our fourth graders had a 12% drop in math. However, comparing the fourth grade cohort group, we had a 2% increase from their third grade diagnostic score to their fourth grade diagnostic score.

Again, there are no consistent patterns or trends over time in any particular subgroup or test.

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.

Using the FY19 FSA data, of the School Grade Components, our school scored higher on seven of the eight areas. The only area we scored lower than the state was our ELA Lowest 25% with a -3% difference.

Using the FY19 FSA data, School to State Comparison, the greatest decrease was third grade math with a 10% deficit compared to the state average. Our third grade ELA average score was 6% lower than the state average.

We see no consistent patterns or trends over time in any particular grade to explain the gap in scores.

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

Using the FY19 FSA data, as a school, our Math Learning Gains increased from 69% to 77% and our Math Learning Gains for white students increased 22%. FY18, our fifth grade math teacher was on maternity leave for three months with multiple substitute teachers trying to fill her shoes. She returned for FY19. In examination of our subgroup data, our ELL ELA Learning Gains increased 33%. FY19 was our second year implementing a new approach to reading intervention. In addition, our reading coach provided support for both core instruction and intervention.

Comparing our FY20 Winter Diagnostic subgroup scores to our FSA FY19 subgroup scores, our Students With Disabilities scores increased in both our ELA (9.5%) and Math scores (3.9%). In FY20

we were allocated an additional .5 ESE teacher, allowing us to more strategically group ESE students for support as well as increase hours of support. Each year we revise intervention schedules to better accommodate student needs and best match interventionists with students.

Comparing our FY20 Winter Diagnostics to our FY19 Winter Diagnostics, the greatest increase was in our multi-ethnic subgroup, increasing their score by 38%.

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

Based on the data presented in EWS reflection FY19 students, 68 out of 376 total students (18%) had attendance below 90%. Our kindergarten through second grade students (42 out of 183 [23%]) represented the largest number of students with attendance below 90%. In second grade, 20 out of 65 students (31%) had less than 90% attendance.

Our greatest areas of concern is attendance and its affects on academics. The greatest absences appeared in kindergarten through second grade. Our focus is to increase student engagement so students become active learners in their own academic journey. We will implement an attendance liaison program where resource staff members will support every classroom in grades K-5 and paras in Prek, to help with those interactions with families when a student is absent. The Leadership Team will analyze absenteeism and will assist in areas that require more attention and follow up.

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

1. Reading core instruction (k-5)
2. Early reading intervention (k-2)
3. Science core instruction (k-5)
4. Math core instruction (k-5)
5. Attendance

During PLCs, we will focus on developing effective and relevant instruction through: unpacking standards, analyzing data, developing standards based lesson using vetted resources and materials from the District, share best practices, following/participating with the coaching continuum model, incorporate research based strategies included but not limited to GO-To Strategies, balanced literacy, small group instruction, and differentiated learning. Teachers will engage in common planning as well as lesson study to improve instructional capacity. Professional development opportunities include district support/training, in-school coaching opportunities, and independent study. Teachers are encouraged to share best practice implementation at PLCs and Common Planning as a way of increasing grade level capacity as a whole. By developing strong teachers, we are able to increase student achievement as well as close the achievement gap.

At DDES , we focus on student achievement, student learning gains and overall social / emotional growth. We believe that if we dedicate time to the following priorities we will ensure an equitable and equal opportunity for all our students by positively influencing:
- A clear and focused path to success
- Development of time management & preparedness
- Increased intrinsic motivation
- Self-Measurement progress
- Increased self-confidence and independence
- Development of Grit and Resilience in facing challenges
- Enhanced Social-Emotional Learning opportunities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase number of ELA proficient students in alignment with the District Strategic Plan; LTO #1 FY19 FSA ELA data indicates 53% of grade three students tested proficient in reading, 60% of grade four students tested proficient in reading and 64% of grade five students tested proficient in reading. The ELA Winter Diagnostic data indicates 56% of grade three students, 61% of grade four student, and 54% of our grade five students tested proficient in reading. We are working to close the gap between our proficiency and the school district's LTO #1. In kindergarten, FY19 EOY RRR Independent Levels indicated 45% of students were reading at a proficient level, and iReady data indicates one years reading growth. In grade one, FY19 EOY RRR Independent Levels was 41% of students were reading at a proficient level, and iReady data indicates 25% of a year's reading growth. In grade two, FY19 EOY RRR Independent Levels was 60% of students were reading at a proficient level, and iReady data indicates less than 75% of a year's reading growth. iReady data indicates less than one years reading growth in grade three.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our grade three proficiency from 53% to 60% on FY21 FSA ELA, a 7% increase. Increase our grade four proficiency from 60% to 68% on FY21 FSA ELA, an 8% increase. Increase our grade five proficiency from 64% to 70% on FY21 FSA ELA, a 6% increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Battles (debbie.battles@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Students will be provided targeted small group differentiated instruction during core ELA block. 2. Identified students will be provided supplemental/intensive intervention based on the School District of Palm Beach County Reading Intervention Plan and Decision Tree. Instruction will include use of evidence based strategies and programs such as Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), instructional strategies for text processing or comprehension needs, and a multisensory approach to teaching of phonics. 3. Students will be remediated and enriched using iReady and after school tutorial as needed. 4. Students will be provided additional weekly content based Science instruction to build background knowledge and vocabulary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student success is multifaceted and addressed first and foremost through attending to social emotional learning needs and integrating these throughout the day in conjunction with core instruction, intervention, remediation and content knowledge building. By providing explicit SEL and academic instruction across content areas that incorporate a variety of strategies to meet learning styles and needs, students can develop a strong foundation for learning and reading. Various instructional approaches are included in our plan, including multisensory to engage multiple senses when learning new concepts. Additionally, using programs such as Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) supports student acquisition of basic reading skills and higher order skills. The use of iReady allows students to learn in a different modality and have opportunities to work at their individual level and own pace. Finally, the addition of science content teaching will allow students to build background knowledge and academic vocabulary, in support of their literacy development.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategies 1&2:
1. Teachers use district assessments to identify student needs to be addressed during small group/ individual core instruction as well as during intervention if it is determined that the student is in need of intervention.
2. Teachers determine best method of delivery and materials (i.e. guided reading, shared reading, multisensory phonics) based on data.
3.Teachers monitor progress and re-assess student needs to reorganize groupings, and modify instruction.
4. Teachers participate in monthly ELA Cadre offered by district Literacy Department.
5. Teachers collaborate regularly in Grade level PLCs to study and improve instruction in collaboration with LIteracy Coaches, interventionists and resource teachers in order to align instruction.

Person Responsible Lisa Fitzpatrick (lisa.fitzpatrick@palmbeachschools.org)

Strategy 3:
1. Implement iReady diagnostic to determine student placement (below, on or above to meet student need).
2. Monitor student performance and make appropriate adjustments to assigned lessons based on demonstrated performance on iReady and classroom assignments.
3. Provide after school tutorial for grades 3-5 students in Reading, Math, Writing, and Science.
4. Provide additional science based learning opportunities to students in Afterschool Programming.

Person Responsible Jill East (jill.east@palmbeachschools.org)

Strategy 4:
1. Provide additional weekly science lessons in marine science to build background knowledge in an area of study relevant to where we live.
2. Integrate in social studies concepts to build additional core knowledge (i.e. human impact on environment, how to help our community, etc.)
3. PD provided to classroom teachers in the subject area to build their knowledge and integrate with NGSSS standards based science instruction.
4. Provide opportunities for students to incorporate new science knowledge into student led school activities that require Literacy Skills (i.e. researching and writing Tank Talk segment on morning announcements)

Person Responsible Teresa Salvatore-Fuller (teresa.salvatore-fuller@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We implement and provide Social Emotional Learning through the practice of Conscious Discipline strategies, structures, and routines-i.e. Brain Smart Start (activities to unite, connect, disengage stress, and make commitments), Safe Place, Morning Greeting, Wish Well, Conflict Resolution, Seven Skills and Powers, Language of Unity, etc...to all staff and students.

Rigorous school-wide implementation of Conscious Discipline research-based strategies improves students' self-awareness and self-regulation skills, which promotes problem solving. When students improve their self-awareness, students will also become aware of treating others with equity and respect, which will contribute to the creation of a school community. Conscious Discipline promotes safety, connection, and problem solving resulting in a positive school culture and climate.

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. Our SWPBS Team conducted a behavior matrix and posted expectation posters throughout the school, as well as kid friendly videos. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. We also have parent/family multicultural nights. Implementation is monitored during Data chats and classroom Learning Walks.

Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures through in class learning and through the various clubs offered at out school.

We instill citizenship through our Safety Patrols, this group consist of only 5th grade students who are responsible, respectful, and set a good example for all the students. Their main job is to maintain the safety of our students. They begin their day on post at 7:30AM by assisting students throughout our campus. At the end of the day, they are back on post ensuring that the students get home safely! Safety Patrols who prove to be responsible and respectful also have the opportunity to travel to Washington D.C. for the annual field trip. This trip is only open to safety patrols and consists of a 4-day tour of Williamsburg/Jamestown, and Washington D.C. It is truly an honor for students to serve as patrols in this club, and we are very proud of all of our patrols who are such positive role models!

This SEL approach has become the focus of our SwPBS committee to be sure that we have school-wide norms and practices that are consistent from classroom to classroom. We also provide monthly parenting workshops to teach the parents what we are implementing at school and how they can implement this SEL practice in the home.

The SBT Team uses the Problem Solving Model to conduct meetings. During meetings

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Parents are an integral part of every school. Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary is constantly seeking out innovative ways in which we can involve more parents in our school program. Our current opportunities for involving our parents are our School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), Conscious Discipline Workshops and annual events. SAC meetings include school administration updates on our school's climate, personnel, and academics. There is time on the agenda where members are invited to give their opinions and bring up new business for discussion.

Parents are offered other opportunities to be involved in their child(ren)'s school life. We offer the following trainings and informational meetings:
- Conscious Discipline Workshops
- Helping you Child at Home Family Night to help parents with strategies for academic success.
- Breakfast & Books with Dad
- FSA Informational meeting - who, what, where, when , why, and how of state testing for grades 3-5.
- Reading Book Fairs and other media center events for parents including activities to do with their child.

School agendas have been given free of charge to all K-5 students, no child is excluded. These agendas are used daily by teachers as a convenient way to facilitate communication between home and school.

Developing students' social and emotional skills is a priority on our school campus as we create a safe and connected school environment. DDE will continue full implementation of Conscious Discipline (CD), a whole-school solution for social-emotional learning, discipline, self-regulation and classroom management. CD strategies and structures transform school culture into a safe haven of cooperation, constructive problem-solving and academic success. Helpfulness and acts of service are an essential component in meeting these needs. Students have opportunities for jobs and to make contributions to the greater good throughout the entire school community. In addition, self-regulation, self-awareness, and problem solving skills are being taught school-wide to all stakeholders. Free parent CD workshops are provided monthly to help promote continuity of the strategies between home and school.

The Guidance Counselor provides both counseling and skills groups to students who are identified as needing additional support. In FY20, we acquired a Behavioral Health Professional who works with students on strategies and social skills that extends beyond the classroom.

When a child is not responding to the strategies offered by the classroom teacher, the child may be referred to the School Based Team (SBT). The core SBT is comprised of administration, ESE coordinator teacher, SAI teacher, school psychologist, classroom teacher(s), Crisis Intervention Teacher (CIT), and guidance counselor. Other teachers join as necessary (DHH teacher, ELL teacher, etc... This team problem-solves

using data to identify students' academic, social-emotional, and behavioral strengths and challenges and then makes decisions about instruction, goals, and interventions to assist the child with success, understanding that the resources may be outside of our school's resources. The team monitors the student's response to these interventions and continues or modifies as needed. The Florida Continuous Improvement Model (Plan. Do. Check. Act) is utilized in the problem-solving process.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$113,535.49**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100		1541 - Dwight D. Eisenhower K 8	Title, I Part A	1.5	$103,535.49
			Notes: Reading Resource Teachers to provide remediation support.			
	5100		1541 - Dwight D. Eisenhower K 8	Other	0.0	$7,000.00
			Notes: Tutorials for Reading, Writing, Math, and Science funded through ASP.			
	6150		1541 - Dwight D. Eisenhower K 8	Title, I Part A	0.0	$1,000.00
			Notes: Partial funding of consultant for Conscious Discipline Parent Workshops.			
	6150		1541 - Dwight D. Eisenhower K 8	Other	0.0	$2,000.00
			Notes: Partial funding of consultant for Conscious Discipline Parent Workshops funded by ASP.			
					Total:	**$113,535.49**