

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Eisenhower Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	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	73%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position 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
Maathis, Reginald	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal responsible for Administration

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

84

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,310

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	440	352	518	0	0	0	0	1310	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	216	5	0	0	0	0	415	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	102	119	0	0	0	0	329	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	133	113	0	0	0	0	372	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	65	2	0	0	0	0	142	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/15/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				43%	51%	54%	44%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	52%	54%	50%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	47%	47%	39%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				51%	55%	58%	52%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				51%	57%	57%	55%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	52%	51%	46%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				43%	47%	51%	36%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				57%	67%	72%	61%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	37%	53%	-16%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	53%	-7%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	54%	62%	-8%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2021					
	2019	15%	31%	-16%	46%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	48%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	55%	67%	-12%	71%	-16%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Formative assessments, voluntary progress monitoring assessments, baseline and midyear testing, Achieve 3000 for ELA percentages at meets or above on AP1, AP2, AP3

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	34%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	13%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	0	16%	16%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43.5	46.69	
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.5	44.29	
	Students With Disabilities	36.5	40.28	
	English Language Learners	46.55	28.8	

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	35%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.5%	12%	14.5%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	36%	36%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50.8	53.98	
	Economically Disadvantaged	55.5	48.68	
	Students With Disabilities	55.5	53.98	
	English Language Learners	11	31.63	
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	46%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	44%	
	Students With Disabilities	33%	47%	
	English Language Learners	29%	38%	

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	36.5%	38.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	19%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	36%	36%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52.8	35.89	
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	35.74	
	Students With Disabilities	60.8	32.82	
	English Language Learners	18	35.89	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	47.6	45.69	
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.60	46.79	
	Students With Disabilities	44.7	39.12	
	English Language Learners	20.10	20.63	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	36	28	16	25	19	17	27			
ELL	20	35	31	23	28	30	23	24	75		
ASN	59	74		72	52			90			
BLK	27	34	24	22	27	20	24	33	67		
HSP	35	40	33	31	34	34	33	35	62		
MUL	40	37		47	32		29	58	36		
WHT	43	39	36	46	38	31	39	59	75		
FRL	31	36	28	30	32	27	26	39	63		
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	34
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	83%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Subgroups from 2019 showed need for improvement in ESE and ELL in all content areas. Math showed largest loses in both learning gains and achievement levels across all 6th and 7th grade, and Algebra.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Learning Gains in Math (-18), and ELA (-8), Proficiency level sin Math (-16), Science (-11), Civics (-12), and Algebra (-12)

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

7 vacancies occurred in multiple core content areas for the 2nd semester and unable to be filled. Approximately 55% of student population started in eLearning and approximately 25% finished year on eLearning for entire school year. Also had 5-10% of student population not take FSA test. Students on quarantine may not have had sufficient support for instructional learning while out. New actions to help improvement would be filling all core vacancies as soon as possible. Areas of students in eLearning will not exist this school year at this time. Plan to offer more targeted after school support systems for ELA, Math and 8th grade Science and 7th grade Civics students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

6th grade ELA showed 1% improvement in proficiency. 8th grade Math showed 15% improvement in proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

6th grade ELA had more one-to-one student strategies implemented in site based classrooms. 8th grade Math had 2 Math teachers for the 1st semester but lost 1 in second semester. 7th grade accelerated math students were prepared to test 8th grade FSA standards. Math teachers had greater awareness of BQ students.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Intentional student collaboration within lessons
Differentiation of lessons

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Differentiation in lesson planning

Teacher leaders for literacy and math and science used as a resource for teachers for demonstration classrooms

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

increased opportunities for small group/collaboration work with targeted students in ELA, Math, Civics, and 8th grade Science. Student will be identified based on FSA or optional assessment scores and targeted for learning gains and movement to proficiency levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data shows a decline in student learning gains in ELA and Math. The bottom quartile students in these areas also showed declines in ELA and Math. In order for all students to show learning gains, teachers need to be able to design and execute lessons that teach to the complexity of the standards for all students.

Measurable Outcome: Learning gains in ELA and Math will increase by 5% from the 2019 levels in both regular gains and the bottom quartile.

Monitoring: Teachers will administer all required progress monitoring testing. Departments will work to voluntarily select and administer specific optional assessments to also be able to use for progress monitoring.
SALs and Administration will pull data after testing and analyze for student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher leaders for Literacy and Math/Science will be available for voluntary coaching cycles, classroom visits, or planning sessions with teachers when requested by teacher.. Leaders can observe, provide feedback, help with lesson plan development, coach with teachers and help look at areas teacher has requested assistance with. Leaders can also work with pull outs of targeted groups of students or push into classrooms when requested by teacher to help accelerate learning for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher leaders have 3 periods each day to conduct class visits, coaching cycles or lesson planning with teachers when they request to work with teacher leaders. Feedback given to teachers after working with them. Goal would be to provide resources to teachers who request support and have teacher leaders assist those teachers who work with them to help increase student learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher leaders will provide times they can be available to teachers, implement demonstration classrooms for teachers to observe, and present data on student growth at ILT when appropriate.

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

ILT will meet 2 times per month to discuss data trends and monitor areas of strength and areas of need

Person Responsible Robert Stingone (robert.stingone@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 difficulty in achieving proficiency levels in ELA, Math, Science and Civics.
Measurable Outcome:	Goal is to increase ESE subgroup proficiency levels to 41% in ELA, Math, Science, and Civics on the 2021-2022 FSA and Civics EOCs.
Monitoring:	Teachers will administer all required progress monitoring testing. Departments will work to voluntarily select and administer specific optional assessments to also be able to use for progress monitoring. SALs and Administration will pull data after testing and analyze for student growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher leaders for Literacy and Math/Science will be available for voluntary coaching cycles, classroom visits, or planning sessions with teachers when requested by teacher.. Leaders can observe, provide feedback, help with lesson plan development, coach with teachers and help look at areas teacher has requested assistance with. Leaders can also work with pull outs of targeted groups of students or push into classrooms when requested by teacher to help accelerate learning for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher leaders have 3 periods each day to conduct class visits, coaching cycles or lesson planning with teachers when they request to work with teacher leaders. Feedback given to teachers after working with them. Goal would be to provide resources to teachers who request support and have teacher leaders assist those teachers who work with them to help increase student learning gains.
Action Steps to Implement	
Teacher leaders will provide times they can be available to teachers, implement demonstration classrooms for teachers to observe, and present data on student growth at ILT when appropriate..	
Person Responsible	Anabel Guichardo-Martinez (anabel.guichardo-martinez@hcps.net)
ILT will meet 2 times per month to discuss data trends and monitor areas of strength and areas of need	
Person Responsible	Robert Stingone (robert.stingone@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 difficulty in achieving proficiency levels in ELA, Math, Science and Civics.

Measurable Outcome: Goal is to increase ELL subgroup proficiency levels to 41% in ELA, Math, Science, and Civics on the 2021-2022 FSA and Civics EOCs.

Monitoring: Teachers will administer all required progress monitoring testing. Departments will work to voluntarily select and administer specific optional assessments to also be able to use for progress monitoring. SALs and Administration will pull data after testing and analyze for student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teacher leaders for Literacy and Math/Science will be available for voluntary coaching cycles, classroom visits, or planning sessions with teachers when requested by teacher.. Leaders can observe, provide feedback, help with lesson plan development, coach with teachers and help look at areas teacher has requested assistance with. Leaders can also work with pull outs of targeted groups of students or push into classrooms when requested by teacher to help accelerate learning for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teacher leaders have 3 periods each day to conduct class visits, coaching cycles or lesson planning with teachers when they request to work with teacher leaders. Feedback given to teachers after working with them. Goal would be to provide resources to teachers who request support and have teacher leaders assist those teachers who work with them to help increase student learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher leaders will provide times they can be available to teachers, implement demonstration classrooms for teachers to observe, and present data on student growth at ILT when appropriate..

Person Responsible

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

ILT will meet 2 times per month to discuss data trends and monitor areas of strength and areas of need

Person Responsible

Robert Stingone (robert.stingone@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Fighting and Physical Attack are the primary and secondary areas of concern that we will monitor during the 2021-2022 school year. Discipline and behavior tracker data will be pulled every 4-9 weeks and reviewed by PBIS/Discipline committees.

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.

Positive School Culture will be addressed in multiple faucets:

7 Mindsets program will be available to be used by all teachers weekly with students for SEL direct teaching
 Medal of Honor character education program will be done monthly through all social studies classes
 Club Day will occur one time per month during the school day to promote student connection
 PBIS program used daily to recognize students showing positive behaviors and meeting 5 STARS
 Anchored for Life program to begin 2nd semester

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Classroom teachers implementing 7 mindsets weekly, PBIS program daily, sponsoring clubs monthly
 Social Studies teachers implementing medal of honor program
 Staff sponsoring clubs for monthly club day
 Anchored for life program will have 3 staff sponsors and multiple student sponsors by grade level

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00