Eisenhower Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eisenhower Middle School

7620 OLD BIG BEND RD, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christian Finch

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

Eisenhower Middle School

7620 OLD BIG BEND RD, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To prepare our students to be productive and informed members of society by building Relationships that foster Self- Discipline, Integrity and Accountability through a culture of Respect.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building Five Star Generals One Star at at Time.

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
Stingone, Robert	Principal	Oversee the instruction program, safety, and learning environment for all students, faculty and staff.
Guichardo-Martinez, Anabel	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal responsible for Curriculum implementation
Hall-Clark, Twanya	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal responsible for administrative duties
Sanders, Octavius	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal responsible for administrative duties

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Christian Finch

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.*
3

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.*
20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
79

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	345	412	457	0	0	0	0	1214
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	149	159	0	0	0	0	433
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	14	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	97	111	0	0	0	0	292
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	95	135	0	0	0	0	317
	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	8	16	8	0	0	0	0	32

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	56	24	25	0	0	0	0	105
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	485	404	494	0	0	0	0	1383
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	66	99	0	0	0	0	251
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	86	107	0	0	0	0	299
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	31	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	149	179	0	0	0	0	523

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	109	75	112	0	0	0	0	296

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	28	13	6	0	0	0	0	47
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	485	404	494	0	0	0	0	1383
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	37	54	10	0	2	2	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	86	107	0	0	0	0	203
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	31	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	149	179	0	0	0	0	523

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	3	48	58	0	0	0	0	109

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	28	13	6	0	0	0	0	47
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	43%	51%	54%	42%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	52%	54%	51%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	47%	47%	43%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	51%	55%	58%	53%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	57%	57%	60%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	52%	51%	46%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	43%	47%	51%	36%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	67%	72%	60%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	37%	53%	-16%	54%	-17%
	2018	39%	52%	-13%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	54%	-12%	52%	-10%
	2018	52%	52%	0%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison	3%					
08	2019	46%	53%	-7%	56%	-10%
	2018	37%	54%	-17%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison	9%					
Cohort Comparison	-6%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	62%	-8%	54%	0%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	54%	6%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison	12%					
08	2019	15%	31%	-16%	46%	-31%
	2018	20%	29%	-9%	45%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison	-45%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	41%	47%	-6%	48%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	36%	48%	-12%	50%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	67%	-12%	71%	-16%
2018	60%	65%	-5%	71%	-11%
Compare		-5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
2018	87%	63%	24%	62%	25%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	17	36	32	17	32	29	13	26			
ELL	17	41	34	30	41	39	14	29	85		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	70	59		89	67		75		100		
BLK	34	39	37	39	43	25	33	56	84		
HSP	38	46	39	46	48	32	34	49	88		
MUL	52	43	30	60	54	40	64	71	93		
WHT	52	50	44	60	57	52	55	64	86		
FRL	38	44	39	44	47	33	36	51	85		

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	14	30	26	18	42	41	14	23			
ELL	16	35	32	25	44	46	16	33	92		
ASN	73	60		93	78		64	93			
BLK	31	50	43	42	45	38	26	53	85		
HSP	38	43	33	43	50	49	32	54	77		
MUL	54	53	27	63	65		33	68			
WHT	55	55	49	64	62	45	47	69	79		
FRL	36	46	40	46	51	43	28	57	81		

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	5	35	37	10	35	32	11	27			
ELL	16	39	38	25	42	30	13	33			
ASN	79	88		89	96						
BLK	33	46	45	41	55	44	27	51	74		
HSP	34	47	42	47	58	41	26	53	81		
MUL	38	46		59	62	70	33	70			
WHT	54	58	43	64	62	50	49	71	78		
FRL	34	48	41	45	55	45	28	51	74		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	77
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	43
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	46
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	56
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	58
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.

2019-2020 8th grade Math FSA achievement levels were at 15%. Achievement levels with this group have trended low over the course of the last 3 years, with 2016-2017 showing a rise in percentage. Factors for low trend have been one teacher teaching Pre-Algebra only until 2019-2020 and larger class sizes. Teacher had limited PLC interaction prior to 2019-2020 with Math SAL only.

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

2019-20 Math bottom quartile dropped 12%. Factors involved had been consistent planning for all grade levels not occurring consistently throughout the year. Those grade levels that were able to plan consistently, had some issues with identifying student deficits, creating interventions, and being able to progress monitor students early in school year.

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.

2019-2020 8th grade Math achievement levels had the biggest gap at -31% when compared to the state average. Achievement levels with this group has had a low level trend over the course of the last 3 years with 2016-2017 being the last year there was a rise in percentage. Factors for low trend have been one teacher teaching pre-algebra only, larger class sizes, and lack of PLC time between teacher and other math instructors.

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

2019-2020 Science achievement scores increased by 7%. Students areas of strength and areas of growth were identified early in school year by assessing them and then interventions were designed and implemented. These interventions were created and used throughout Science department at all grade levels, addressing weak strand areas in the daily lesson planning through bell work or were embedded in main parts of lessons.

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

Based on data from 18-19 at this point, two primary areas of concern would be the number of students below 90% in attendance and number of students with one or more suspensions in previous year. Once data for 19-20 is available adjustments to this will be made.

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

1. Student Learning Gains in ELA and Math
2. Increase percentage of students with 90% or higher attendance
3. Decrease % of students with one or more suspensions and overall incident rates.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Designing lesson plans and teaching to the complexity of the standards. Data shows a trend of decline in student learning gains in Math and ELA, especially in the bottom quartile of students. In order to help increase learning gains for all students, teachers need to be able to teach the assessed standards to their proper level of complexity. Teachers will do this by lesson planning and providing differentiation in instruction as needed to ensure students master the standard.
Measurable Outcome:	Student learning gains in ELA and Math will show an increase of 10% on the 2020-2021 FSA and student learning gains in the bottom quartile for ELA and Math will show an increase if 10% on the 2020-2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Stingone (robert.stingone@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SAL's for Reading, Social Studies, Math, ELA, and Science will schedule and conduct mini coaching cycles with each teacher in their department on a rotating basis. Walkthrough forms will be used to document specific student and teacher look fors and that data will be analyzed every two weeks for trends.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All SAL's have been given one extra period off in order to have time to conduct observations and min coaching cycles. SAL's and Reading coach will be able to capture real time data on look fors in daily lessons while conducting these daily observations. This data will be kept in real time and analyzed every two weeks. Trends can be looked for and coaching cycles can be adjusted for individual teachers. Frequent feedback can assist teachers in making modifications to lessons. Goal is to see at least 90% of all teachers meeting the daily look fors in their lessons every 2 weeks.

Action Steps to Implement

Train all new SALs on coaching cycles process.

Person Responsible	Robert Stingone (robert.stingone@hcps.net)

Train all new staff to Eisenhower on coaching cycle process

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

Conduct weekly Walk troughs of all subjects by SAL and Reading coach and collect data to present in ILT meetings 2 times a month.

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

ILT will meet bi-weekly to discuss data and trends and monitor for areas of strength and areas of student need.

Person Responsible	Robert Stingone (robert.stingone@hcps.net)

Schedule any PD as needed based on walkthrough data to help support student learning needs. Continuous improvement cycle will be used to implement, monitor and assess strategies.

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase proficiency levels in the ESE subgroup. ESE subgroup has shown a particular struggle achieving proficiency in ELA, math, Science and Civics. Two year data for the ESE group shows slightly increasing EL percentages in learning gains and proficiency but decreasing percentages in Math and Civics EOC, and no noticeable changes on Science FSA proficiency levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Goal is to increase ESE subgroup proficiency levels to 41% in ELA, Math, Science and Civics EOC levels on the 2020-2021 FSA and Civics EOC tests.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Stingone (robert.stingone@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SAL's for Reading, Social Studies, Math, ELA, and Science will schedule and conduct mini coaching cycles with each ESE teacher in their department on a rotating basis. Walkthrough forms will be used to document specific student and teacher look fors and that data will be analyzed every two weeks for trends. Computer based program for Civics will continue to be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All SAL's have been given one extra period off in order to have time to conduct observations and mini-coaching cycles. SAL's and Reading coach will be able to capture real time data on look fors in daily lessons while conducting these daily observations. This data will be kept in real time and analyzed every two weeks. Trends can be looked for and coaching cycles can be adjusted for individual teachers. Frequent feedback can assist teachers in making modifications to lessons. Goal is to see at least 90% of all teachers meeting the daily look fors in their lessons every 2 weeks.

Action Steps to Implement

Train all new ESE teachers to Eisenhower on coaching cycle process and new Civics teachesr on computer based program for Civics.

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

Ensure all ESE teachers receive observations bi-weekly and feedback provided by SAL.

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

Monitor use of computer program for Civics. Check student use rate, standard mastery levels of student and discuss plan with SAL for fidelity of implementation of plan.

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase proficiency levels in the ELL subgroup. ELL subgroup has shown a particular struggle achieving proficiency in ELA, math, Science and Civics. Two year data for the ELL group shows slightly increasing ELA percentages in learning gains and proficiency but decreasing percentages in Math, Science, and Civics EOC.
Measurable Outcome:	Goal is to increase ELL subgroup proficiency levels to 41% in ELA, Math, Science and Civics EOC levels on the 2020-2021 FSA and Civics EOC tests.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Stingone (robert.stingone@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SAL's for Reading, Social Studies, Math, ELA, and Science will schedule and conduct mini coaching cycles with each teacher on ELL students in their department on a rotating basis. Walkthrough forms will be used to document specific student and teacher look fors and that data will be analyzed every two weeks for trends. Computer based program for Civics will continue to be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All SAL's have been given one extra period off in order to have time to conduct observations and mini-coaching cycles. SAL's and Reading coach will be able to capture real time data on look fors in daily lessons while conducting these daily observations. This data will be kept in real time and analyzed every two weeks. Trends can be looked for and coaching cycles can be adjusted for individual teachers. Frequent feedback can assist teachers in making modifications to lessons. Goal is to see at least 90% of all teachers meeting the daily look fors in their lessons every 2 weeks.

Action Steps to Implement

Train all new ESE teachers to Eisenhower on coaching cycle process and new Civics teachers on computer based program for Civics.

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

Ensure all ELL teachers receive observations bi-weekly and feedback provided by SAL.

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

Monitor use of computer program for Civics. Check student use rate, standard mastery levels of student and discuss plan with SAL for fidelity of implementation of plan.

Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Increasing the percentage of students with 90% or higher attendance by 5%. Focus will be on implementation of tier 1 school wide plan for attendance. OBIS team will implement attendance portion of plan for tier 1 such as recognition of individual student attendance and potential grade level recognition of achieving grade level goal percentages monthly. Tier 2 students must be identified by homeroom teacher and student services group and plans for attendance improvements will be developed with student services personnel. Tier 3 students will be identified to instructional staff and social worker will coordinate plan with all instructional persons involved with students to affect positive change in attendance patterns,

2. Decreasing number of discipline incidents and days of suspension by 20%. Focus on multi-tiered approach to decrease overall discipline incidents and suspension days for students. Discipline committee in conjunction with PBIS team will collect, disaggregate, and disseminate data in behavior tracker to show school wide trends in discipline. Data will be analyzed monthly, and interventions will be implemented and adjusted based on data. Analysis of PBIS plan will occur monthly to ensure implementation of tier 1 supports. Implementation of school based mentoring program will occur to focus interventions for selected tier 2 students. Identification of tier 3 students will occur through administration and student services. MTSS meetings will occur bi-weekly to discuss tier 3 student interventions, behavior plans put in place and results analyzed to ensure improvements.

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.

Positive School Culture will be addressed in multiple faucets:
Implementation of dedicated SEL teaching during designated time in school day for all students
Implementation of Medal of Honor Program through all ELA and Social Studies classes for character education
Implementation of club day within school day once per month at minimum to promote student connection to school.
Implementation of student government for all homerooms to encourage student involvement of school operations
Promotion of PTSA and SAC committee for parent involvement
Quarterly parent nights covering pertinent topics for parents to promote student success
Quarterly conference nights for parents to stay informed on student academic success
Weekly communication with all stakeholders through parent link messaging

Increase use of social media platforms such as Edsby(canvas), or other approved social media systems to communicate with families

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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