Eisenhower Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eisenhower Elementary School

2800 DREW ST, Clearwater, FL 33759

http://www.eisenhower-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Tijuana Baker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically **Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Eisenhower Elementary School

2800 DREW ST, Clearwater, FL 33759

http://www.eisenhower-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.

Eisenhower Elementary achieves success by increasing opportunities for all scholars by providing a respectful community with high expectations and student centered instruction in order to prepare all students for college and career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Growing tomorrow's leaders today.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Antonette	Principal	Responsible for the creation, fidelity, and implementation.
Durocher , Jyllene	Assistant Principal	Responsible for the creation, fidelity, and implementation.
Painter , Sarah	Other	Responsible for the documentation of actions steps and strategies and their impact on student progress.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/7/2012, Tijuana Baker

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
50

Total number of students enrolled at the school
650

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	86	97	95	91	109	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	577
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 6/29/2022

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	44	91	94	94	102	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	517
Attendance below 90 percent	2	30	30	25	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	44	91	94	94	102	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	517
Attendance below 90 percent	2	30	30	25	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	55%	56%				46%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						62%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						63%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	51%	50%				54%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						67%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						63%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	62%	59%				45%	53%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	34%	56%	-22%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	48	40	39	72	75	14				
ELL	36	49	30	56	66	53	33				
BLK	33	56	58	52	71	65	32				
HSP	42	54	35	59	64	59	39				
MUL	44	36		56	55						
WHT	66	73		67	70		60				
FRL	45	58	40	61	69	61	42				

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	23	20		19	30						
ELL	34	43	33	52	56	36	36				
BLK	25	44		30	31		33				
HSP	38	46	38	55	60	28	43				
WHT	54	50		53	57		71				
FRL	39	48	40	49	54	32	48				
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	12	24	33	26	42	50	9				
ELL	34	60	65	53	76	70	29				
BLK	47	59	50	44	45		37				
HSP	39	59	66	55	77	71	32				
MUL	56	69		61	69						
WHT	55	68		57	59		62				
FRL	43	61	63	53	66	62	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	51
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	48
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	69
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The trends that we noticed across grade levels and sub groups are scholrs lack of skills to decode, break apart words, understanding of word parts, and vocabulary Often impeded instructional staff ability to expose scholars consistently to grade level text and task.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data we used was from: MAP K-2 vocabulary, and 3-5 vocabulary acquision. ELFAC data in K-2 and selected 3rd grade class. Small skill groups data in grades K-5. Istation data in grades K-5ie text fluency, vocabulary, spelling, phonic awareness, decoding, and word analysis.

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

Some contributing factors are instructional staff ability to diagnose scholars gaps in reading and math and access to the appropriate intervention resources with consistency and fidelity.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

When analyzing MAP and Istation data we noticed improvement in vocabulary, decoding, and text fluency and MAP Fall to Winter math scores.

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

For the 2022-2023 School year we have included in our staff model an MTSS coach to help us dig deeper into the data and what is interrupting our scholars ability to read and comprehend on and above grade level. Looking at interventive resources that address the interruption. Once identified creating and monitoring schedules that provide the invention consistency and fidelity.

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

School leaders and instructional staff will consistently analyze data in order to plan for gaps of learning and barriers to learning in order that all scholrs succeed.

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.

PD that will help school leaders and instructional staff actively identify and work to eliminate academic barriers that limit students' access to relevant and challenging learning opportunities. (Taken from AVID Framework)

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

1. Continuation of Project 23 Math and ELA for K-3 scholars.
2. Understanding and Planning with BEST Standards K-5
3. Module/ Unit Collaborative Planning and PD to include ELL and ESE Resource Teachers

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	2021-2022 FSA Data indicates some scholars are performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science. Our data analysis indicates that this is possibly happening due to the inconsistency and type of interventions identified scholars receive to fill academic learning gaps that impedes comprehension, the ability to analyze and synthesize text for meaning, use vocabulary to interpret meaning and understand science concepts, and math fluency and application. As well as the balance of time, monitoring, and feedback all scholars are given during core instruction while engaging in grade level task in ELA, Math, and Science. This is evident by the number of scholars performing at level 3 or above.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase by 10% from 46% to 56% as measured by the FAST Assessment (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) Proficiency in Science will increase by 10% from 42% to 52% as measured by the NGSSS (Next Generation Sunshine State Standards) Proficiency in Math will increase by 10% from 60% to 70% as measured by the FAST Assessment (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking)
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring ELA and Math and Science Assessments. Monitoring will also happen during classroom visit by administration and district leadership, PLC data discussions, and analyzing and planning of student work.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Gain a deep understanding of the BEST Standards and a better understanding of the NGSSS standards as a non negotiable for improving scholars outcomes. 2. Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to grade level standards and evidence-based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Understanding the depth and complexity of the BEST Standards/NGSSS will help guide the expectations of what scholars are being taught and expected to do in whole and small group settings.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlight benchmark and NGSSS standards.

Person Responsible	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all scholars during core and independent instruction including support for scholars with expectational needs, ELL supports, as well as extensions and more advanced texts for scholars above the benchmark.

Person Responsible	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

AVID: Insist on Rigor Action Step....
Instructional staff will provide learning experiences in which every scholar is challenged, engaged, and develops a greater ownership of their learning through increasingly complex levels of understanding in ELA, Math and Science.

Person Responsible	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

Math:
Monitoring whole group and small group instruction using the MTR (Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards) Tool.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	2021-2022 FSA Data indicates that our Scholars with Disabilities are performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science. ELA 20% proficient, Math 39% proficient, and 14% proficient, Our data analysis indicate this is evident by inconsistent opportunities in task aligned to grade level standards while meeting IEP Goals.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our plan is to increase our scholars with disabilities proficiency by at least 10% in ELA, Math, and Science as measured by the FAST Assessment in ELA and Math and the NGSSS Assessment in Science. Ensure a weekly balance between IEP Goals minutes and exposure to grad level standards and task with appropriate scaffolds.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Area of focus will be monitored through IEP meetings, IEP progress reports, data chats with administration, and classroom push in and small group observation and walkthrough data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards aligned, rigorous expectations for identified ESE scholars.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The 2022 FSA Data data indicates our ESE scholars are showing the expected grade level growth slower than other 7 subgroups. The Federal Index for 2022 was 44% only 3% above the Federal Index of 41%.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

AVID Action Step:
Use inquiry-based, collaborative strategies to challenge and engage scholars in content resulting in increasingly complex levels of understanding." (Model, Design, and Guide)

Person Responsible	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

Make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum in ELA, Math and Science to maximize impact on student learning .

Person Responsible	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	22021-2022 FSA Data indicates that our black students are performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science. ELA 33% proficient, Math52% proficient, and 32% proficient. Our data analysis indicate this is evident by inconsistent opportunities in task aligned to grade level standards with monitoring and feedback.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our plan is to increase our black scholars proficiency by at least 10% in ELA, Math, and Science as measured by the FAST Assessment in ELA and Math and the NGSSS Assessment in Science.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Area of focus will be monitored through, PMP's written for black scholars, data chats with administration, and classroom push in and small group observation and walkthrough data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence based practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	According to the Federal Index our Black Scholars are performing at 52% which is 11% points above the Federal Index. In order to keep performing above the index we must implement and monitor specific strategies in ELA, Math, and Science.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

AVID: Academic Preparedness
Help scholars to develop academic skills that will allow them to successfully complete rigorous curriculum and experiences.

Person Responsible	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

AAVID:
Give scholars research opportunities, allow them to set goals, help them make choices that support their long-term aspirations, and successfully navigate transitions through academic and behavior demands in ELA, Math, and Science.

Person Responsible	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our current data indicates that during the 2021-2022 school year about 50 referrals were written. Of those referrals they referenced two male scholars the majority of the time. Ninety five precent of the referrals were written on males.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Will reduce the number of referrals about males from 95% to 35%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This will be monored through the recreation of the referral process by implementing a flow chart that indicates when and why an office referral should be written.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Judith Smith (smithjudithj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PBIS Tracking System. It is an evidence-based framework used by schools to improve school culture and student behavior, promoting a safe environment for learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The multi-device platform makes it easy to continuously recognize students for meeting behavior expectations from anywhere in the school, not just the classroom. And with added features like referral tracking, Check-In/Check-Out, and a teacher rewards system, PBIS Rewards will help foster accountability and fidelity in our PBIS system.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Purchase and Implementation of the PBIS Reward Tracking System.

Person Responsible	Judith Smith (smithjudithj@pcsb.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Eisenhower's identification of gifted scholars is increasing. To better serve the gifted learners and support teachers, selected 3rd -5th grade Eisenhower teachers will be identified as the Gifted Cluster Teachers and participate in the Javits Project. Currently our rising 3rd and 4th grade scholars proficiency in ELA as measured by FSA is 84% (19 scholars) and Math 89% (19 scholars)
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Eisenhower gifted learners ELA, Math, and Science FAST Assessment and SSA scores will meet or exceed state expectations.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The area of focus will be monitored through PD, walkthroughs by the gifted department ISD, participation in the Javits Grant, as well as, FAST and Science Assessments data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Clustering gifted and talented students in grades 3rd - 5th so that the process of differentiating is more effective for gifted learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Gifted learners benefit from curriculum compacting which is a technique that allows for differentiating and making curriculum adjustments. Clustering gifted and talented learners will help teachers to implement curriculum compacting as often as needed

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Gifted Cluster teachers will intentionally plan for differentiation for gifted learners and administrators monitor and provide feedback

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Gifted Cluster Teachers will differentiate for gifted learners through adapting content, thinking skills, resources, and/or objectives and higher order questioning.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Gifted Cluster teachers will attend professional development on "differentiation for gifted learners". Administrators recommend that Deliberate Practice Plans incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of differentiating for gifted and talented learners.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback, etc.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Strategically focus on 3-5 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback, etc.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Fifty precent or more scholars in grade K-2 will show they are on track to show expected growth on the third FAST Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Fifty precent or more scholars in grade 3-5 will show they are on track to pass the end of year FAST End of Year Satate Assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

During the 20220--2023 the School Based Intervention Team and Leadership Literacy team will review our ELA data monthly to ensure we are tracking progress of our scholars towards our grade level expectations/ goals. School and district leaders will monitor though walkthrough, feedback, and follow through.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wilson, Antonette, wilsonanto@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

For the 2022-2023 school year, our K-2 classrooms will implement a small group instruction based on data gathered for EFLAC Data and PD from district ISD on what that looks like.

For the 2022-2023 identified K-3 scholar will receive 25 to 30 minutes additional small group reading instruction through Project 23. Focus will be LLI.

For the 2022-2023 school year, our 3rd grade classrooms will focus on specific small group instructional practices that align with the B.E.S.T. standards and the science of reading. Implementation of LLI and IRLA (where appropriate though PTH Teachers). An instructional routine as well as reciprocal teaching will be in place to promote comprehension skills and fluency practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

During the 2021-2022 school year we observed the beginning or reading fluency and comprehension with our K-3 scholrs who were apart of Project 23. We are expecting to see at least a 10 precent increase in proficiency in grades 3 and 4 as those project 23 scholars transition to grades 3 and 4.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership Team; The literacy leadership team will be responsible for creating and monitoring the comprehensive literacy plan and setting goals for literacy in Pre K -5th.	Wilson, Antonette, wilsonanto@pcsb.org
Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the K-2 B.E.S.T. ELA Standards	Wilson, Antonette, wilsonanto@pcsb.org

Implement a plan for identifying scholars not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all scholars, staff who are sure of their roles and relationships regarding scholars and their learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations

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

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, scholars, and families of scholars, 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.