

Broward County Public Schools

Nova Dwight D. Eisenhower Elem



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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Nova Dwight D. Eisenhower Elem

6501 SW 39TH ST, Davie, FL 33314

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angine Tyghter

Start Date for this Principal: 12/20/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	100%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	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 Broward 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Nova Dwight D. Eisenhower Elem

6501 SW 39TH ST, Davie, FL 33314

[no web address on file]

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 KG-5	Yes	67%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Nova Eisenhower, Where Excellence is Tradition, believes that our mission is to create a productive and effective partnership between all stakeholders while utilizing a differentiated curriculum, allowing our students the opportunity to be college and career ready by the end of high school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ensure that all students are proficient in academic areas so they will be able to succeed in the future.

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
Tyghter , Angine	Principal	Instructional Leader Provide a safe and supportive learning environment Partner with all stakeholders for student success Analyze trend data and identify patterns and instructional strengths and weaknesses Support teachers in planning and creating Instructional Focus Calendars that align with student needs Conduct classroom observations and provide feedback to teachers on their instructional practices. Participate in data chats with every grade level to provide guidance and support for instructional planning and support the data analysis process
Diamond, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader Provide a safe and supportive learning environment Partner with all stakeholders for student success Analyze trend data and identify patterns and instructional strengths and weaknesses Support teachers in planning and creating Instructional Focus Calendars that align with student needs Working with community partners to enhance to learning environment with additional resources and volunteer support Conduct classroom observations and provide feedback to teachers on their instructional practices. Participate in data chats with every grade level to provide guidance and support for instructional planning and support the data analysis process
Fischer, Lorraine	Instructional Coach	Instructional Leader Provide a safe and supportive learning environment Partner with all stakeholders for student success Support teachers through modeling reading lessons in the classroom Help teachers plan lessons and align resources to the standards Participate in data chats with every grade level to provide guidance support for instructional planning Work with struggling students in small groups to help support their phonics and reading comprehension needs

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 12/20/2017, Angine Tyghter

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.*

42

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	100%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	TS&I

* 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	127	125	128	128	132	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	772
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	4	9	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	4	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	127	125	128	128	132	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	772
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	4	9	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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		2	2	0	5	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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		4	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	127	125	128	128	132	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	772
Attendance below 90 percent	11	3	10	9	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	13	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	2	0	5	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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		4	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	67%	59%	57%	68%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	60%	58%	63%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	54%	53%	38%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	65%	63%	68%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	66%	62%	59%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	53%	51%	37%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	46%	53%	66%	45%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	74%	60%	14%	58%	16%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	62%	-1%	58%	3%
	2018	69%	58%	11%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	66%	59%	7%	56%	10%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	65%	4%	62%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	69%	63%	6%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	67%	2%	64%	5%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	62%	64%	-2%	60%	2%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	49%	0%	53%	-4%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	30	38	35	30	32	17	6				
ELL	64	47	27	71	66	40					
ASN	78	55		89	91						
BLK	59	46	33	55	51	21	41				
HSP	75	48		82	75		60				
MUL	88	58		76	42						
WHT	83	70		89	73		69				
FRL	61	48	35	61	51	25	48				

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	22	39	37	22	32	26	8				
ELL	48			59							
ASN	83			89							
BLK	59	57	42	57	54	35	51				
HSP	73	67		76	58		71				
MUL	73			73							
WHT	78	61		79	75		67				

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
FRL	61	59	46	61	54	35	50				
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	57	56	19	33	31	18				
ELL	56	47		60	53		55				
ASN	62			69							
BLK	62	61	39	62	55	36	66				
HSP	67	59	30	69	51	42	67				
MUL	90			70							
WHT	83	67		84	73		62				
FRL	61	59	36	61	51	35	63				

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	78
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	44
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	69
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	77
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	50
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.

30% of SWD achieved proficiency in ELA

38% of SWD achieved ELA learning gains

30% of SWD achieved proficiency in Math

32% of SWD achieved Math learning gains

The contributing factors to the low performance of SWDs include:

- Instruction provided at the students independent learning levels was not enough exposure to grade level rigorous instruction.
- Lack of spiral review of previously taught standards.
- Remediation for standards not mastered with progress monitoring to identify gap areas of understanding.

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

Learning gains for the lowest 25% of students in math and reading declined by 10%.

The contributing factors to the low performance in these areas include:

- Instruction provided at the students independent learning levels was not enough exposure to grade level rigorous instruction.
- Lack of spiral review of previously taught standards.
- Remediation for standards not mastered with progress monitoring to identify gap areas of understanding.

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.

Thirty- six percent (36%) of students in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains in ELA in comparison to the 53% state average. This is a 17% differential for ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% of students.

Twenty-six percent (26%) of students in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains in Math in comparison to the 51% state average. This is a 26% differential for Math learning gains for the lowest 25% of students.

The contributing factors to the low performance in these areas include:

- Instruction provided at the students independent learning levels was not enough exposure to grade level rigorous instruction.
- Lack of spiral review of previously taught standards.
- Remediation for standards not mastered with progress monitoring to identify gap areas of understanding.

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

Seventy-four percent (74%) of third grade students achieved proficient in 2019 in comparison to 65% of third grade students in 2018.

SWD increased 8% points ELA and Math proficiency from 2018 to 2019 with 30% achieving proficiency in 2019 in both Math & ELA.

New actions taken included:

- ESE Teacher involved in grade level curriculum planning
- ESE Teacher rotating push-in & pull out of students to provide targeted support for grade level instruction
- Small group instruction focused on meeting instructional needs of students at their independent instructional level

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

1. SWD need to achieve proficiency at the same rates as non SWD students.
2. Students in the Lowest 25% need to achieve learning gains at the same rates as proficient students.

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

1. Forty-one percent (41%) of SWD will achieve proficiency in ELA and Math.
2. Student proficiency in ELA will increase 10% based on the 2020 FSA.
3. Student proficiency in Math will increase 10% based on the 2020 FSA.
4. Learning gains among students in the Lowest 25% will increase 10% in Math & ELA based, on the 2020 FSA.
5. Sixty percent (60%) of students will achieve proficiency in science, based on the 2020 FCAT Science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based upon our school data for the 2018-2019 school year and previous school year trend data, thirty- six percent (36%) of students in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains in ELA in comparison to the 53% state average.
 This is a 17% differential for ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% of students. This impacts student learning and success, as the students will need additional supports and interventions to bridge the gap in ELA. This subgroup also affects our school grade significantly.

Measurable Outcome:

Learning gains among students in the Lowest 25% will increase 10% in ELA based on the 2020 FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angine Tyghter (angine.tyghter@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress monitoring of standards on a bi-weekly basis
 Small group instruction daily with a focus on rigorous higher order questions
 Grade level instruction in whole group with focus on stamina for longer passages
 Spiral review implemented consistently
 Interventions implemented via push-in support and pull-out groups focused on independent instructional level

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Ongoing progress of student progress in mastering the standards will provide teachers with the most accurate data on student achievement. With this data, teachers will be able to develop targeted small group instruction focused on students' independent instructional level. While meeting the individual needs of the students, teachers will provide grade level whole group instruction at the rigor needed to ensure students are also working at an appropriate pace to master grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Lowest 25% students assessed with BAS by September 10th to provide current instructional level
2. Whole group instruction utilizing LAFS iReady Text
3. Mini ELA formative assessments by standards administered bi-weekly
4. Small group instructional utilizing leveled readers with students engaged in spiral review in centers
5. Remediation and enrichment provided based on formative assessment results

Person Responsible

Lorraine Fischer (lorraine.fischer@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Based upon our school data for the 2018-2019 school year and previous school year trend data, 30% of SWD achieved proficiency in ELA , 38% of SWD achieved ELA learning gains, 30% of SWD achieved proficiency in Math, and 32% of SWD achieved Math learning gains. This impacts student learning and success, as the students will need additional supports and interventions through pull-out groups, in class small reading and math groups that target individual student goals. These four areas have a strong correlation with students reaching proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

Forty-one percent (41%) of SWD will achieve proficiency in ELA and Math.

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

Angine Tyghter (angine.tyghter@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Progress monitoring of standards on a bi-weekly basis
Small group instruction daily with a focus on rigorous higher order questions
Grade level instruction in whole group with focus on stamina for longer passages & strategies to work through complexity of math problems
Spiral review implemented consistently
Interventions implemented via push-in support and pull-out groups focused on independent instructional level

**Rationale for Evidence-
based Strategy:**

Ongoing progress of student progress in mastering the standards will provide teachers with the most accurate data on student achievement. With this data teachers will be able to develop targeted small group instruction focused on students' independent instructional level. While meeting the individual needs of the students, teachers will provide grade level whole group instruction at the rigor needed to ensure students are also working at an appropriate pace to master grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ESE Teacher active participant in curriculum planning
2. Math morning work spiral review and exposure of future standards to build and maintain content mastery
3. ESE Teacher push-in & pull out support model to meet goals and support grade level instruction
4. Monthly grade level Acaletics comprehensive standards based assessment
5. Remediation and enrichment provided based on formative assessment results

Person Responsible

Rochelle Gordon (rochelle.gordon@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- 1. Progress monitoring of standards on a bi-weekly basis**
- 2. Small group instruction daily with a focus on rigorous higher order questions**
- 3. Grade level instruction in whole group with focus on stamina for longer passages & strategies to work through complexity of math problems**
- 4. Spiral review implemented consistently**
- 5. Interventions implemented via push-in support and pull-out groups focused on independent instructional level**
- 6. ESE Teacher active participant in curriculum planning**
- 7. Math morning work spiral review and exposure of future standards to build and maintain content mastery**
- 8. ESE Teacher push-in & pull out support model to meet goals and support grade level instruction**
- 9. Monthly grade level comprehensive standards based assessment**
- 10. Remediation and enrichment provided based on formative assessment results**

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.

Nova Eisenhower Elementary builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by effectively communicating information about curriculum standards, student achievement, and school safety through SAC and PTA meetings. We also host a variety of educational events throughout the year in which all groups can come together to share and learn. Nova Eisenhower Elementary is dedicated to ensuring that all members of our school community are included and feel valued. We invite parents, families, students and community members to our evening parent training events. We offer dinner and other refreshments and conduct instructional sessions designed to expose family members to grade level curriculum, provide them the materials needed to assist their children at home, and teach them basic strategies to use at home. Each year our staff is trained on how to interact with parents, to build relationships with them as partners in their child's education, and ways in which they can include them in their classrooms.

Nova Eisenhower Elementary is dedicated to fulfilling the needs of the whole child. The staff has been trained in Culturally Responsive Teaching. This training guides teachers in building a rapport with all students, families, and other stakeholders. They have also been trained in

the Sanford Harmony SEL program in order to implement social-emotional curriculum in the classrooms. The School Counselor and Social Worker partner with teachers to address the needs of those students identified as having specific concerns by providing counseling, speaking with parents, and/or offering other available services.

Nova Eisenhower Elementary hosts a Kindergarten Round-up in May of each year to welcome parents and students. At the Round-up, parents are informed of the readiness skills their child should possess in order to begin the year successfully. They are also given a tour of the school to help parents and students become more comfortable with the new environment. On the first day of school, parents are invited in to walk their child to class and are then offered refreshments at our "Boo Hoo Breakfast". The fifth grade students, upon reaching the end of their time in elementary school, are taken to the middle school for an orientation.

Nova Eisenhower's ESOL liaison assesses our ELL students during the year to determine their specific needs. She then conducts small group instruction to assist these students in reaching mastery. Our School Counselor goes into classrooms to teach the Silence Hurts program as part of our violence prevention and anti-bullying campaign. All staff is trained annually in anti-bullying to learn how to identify the signs of bullying and how to respond to bullying incidents. Nova Eisenhower teachers are trained in the Sanford Harmony SEL program and implement lessons in their classrooms each day. A free nutritious breakfast is offered to all students each morning to ensure that they are beginning their day ready to learn in the classroom. The leadership team at Nova Eisenhower Elementary meet weekly to monitor these resources and their effectiveness in meeting the needs of our students.

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				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1271 - Nova Dwight D. Eisenhower Elem	School Improvement Funds		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers will be provided for teachers to participate in Off The Floor Planning Days.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1271 - Nova Dwight D. Eisenhower Elem	School Improvement Funds		\$600.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers will be provided for ESE teachers to attend IEP writing training and BAS/RLI Training.</i>			
					Total:	\$4,600.00