

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Eisenhower Middle School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 6/1/2022

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
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: 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	TSI
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	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	79%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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 a Time.

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
Francis, Nathan	Principal	
Demik, Jennifer	Other	
Guichardo-Martinez, Anabel	Assistant Principal	
Maathis, Reginald	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/1/2022, Christian Finch

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.*

1

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,279

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

38

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

21

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	439	361	428	0	0	0	0	1228
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	123	154	0	0	0	0	391
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	105	105	0	0	0	0	235
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	0	0	0	125	117	152	0	0	0	0	394
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	144	168	0	0	0	0	444
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	13	46	57	0	0	0	0	116

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	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
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

Tuesday 7/19/2022

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	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	12	
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	

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	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	12	
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

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	38%	50%	50%				43%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						46%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%						39%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	34%	36%	36%				51%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	42%						51%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						34%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	52%	53%				43%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	58%	58%				57%	67%	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	2022					
	2019	37%	53%	-16%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	53%	-7%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	54%	62%	-8%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2022					
	2019	15%	31%	-16%	46%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	48%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	55%	67%	-12%	71%	-16%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

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	19	29	22	15	33	43	14	26	50		
ELL	16	33	28	15	32	46	7	31	42		
ASN	61	58		70	70		80	50			
BLK	32	33	26	25	37	41	26	53	68		
HSP	37	38	31	28	40	45	32	55	65		
MUL	45	27	8	38	37		40	44	80		
WHT	44	42	19	47	49	54	50	56	77		
FRL	32	34	27	29	38	43	30	49	65		
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		
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		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	65
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Most groups showed improvement. Overall ESSA Federal Index rose over 41% and four of the five subgroups missing the target showed improvements. Math showed the largest increases in learning gains, while ELA showed the largest losses.

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

Students in the Lowest 25 Percentile group for ELA have decreased for the last two consecutive years. Data shows a loss of 5% this year and a total of 13% over the last two years.

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

Multiple vacancies were unable to be filled throughout the year. This led to inconsistent content delivery to students. In addition, grade level teachers were unable to plan together due to coverage. Those who were able to plan had some difficulty identifying student deficits and creating interventions. The progress monitoring assessments utilized by the district did not accurately predict student success on the state exams.

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

Students in the Lowest 25 Percentile group for Math showed the greatest improvement with an increase of 17% and Math gains for All Students increased by 9%.

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

Students returned from eLearning and engaged in face-to-face instruction. Teachers collaborated and utilized district provided common calendars for instruction. Progress monitoring assessments offered by the district accurately predicted student success on state exams and teachers used the deficiency data to plan remediation lessons.

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

Strategies to be implemented include:

Planning and delivering explicit instruction using a series of supports or scaffolds to guide students through learning.

Engaging students in active learning.

Utilization of small groups to differentiate.

Administering common assessments and disaggregating the results

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.

Professional development opportunities could include gradual release, effective utilization of small groups, how to interpret data from common assessments, and engaging difficult students.

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

Professional Learning Communities will utilize the continuous improvement model. Common planning time will be built into the master schedule when feasible and data from common assessments drive lesson plans.

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.**

We will plan and deliver explicit instruction of grade level appropriate material utilizing a series of supports or scaffolds, where our students are encouraged to take ownership of their learning as teachers guide them through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for the learning the new skill, clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target, and supported practice with feedback.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of this year, our school grade calculations will increase by 2% in overall achievement points for all contents measured (ELA, Math, Science & Civics) and by 3% in gains for ELA and Math.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

PLC facilitators will report instructional plans and walkthroughs will be utilized to monitor the implementation of the plans. SALs and Administrators will monitor the learning targets, how long the direct instruction is taking place, and the results of the ongoing assessments. Progress monitoring assessments will be used to monitor student performance as a result of the targeted instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan Francis (nathan.francis@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Explicit Instruction of grade appropriate material includes:

- * Direct Instruction
 - * Reciprocal Teaching
 - * Feedback
 - * Student Self-Verbalization
- Supported Practice includes:
- * Small Groups
 - * Partner Discussions

implemented for this Area of Focus.

- * Socratic Seminars
- * Projects

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy: Student ownership is the amount of investment learners have in the topics they are learning, the methods they are learning through, and the places where it happens. As educators, we have to try to maximize our already limited instructional time. The effectiveness of explicit instruction has been validated repeatedly by research involving general education and special education students. According to the 'Barometer of Influence', explicit instruction has an effect size of 0.57 in knowledge activated (Meta-Analysis, Hattie, 2009). Direct instruction must be purposeful and should not exceed fifteen minutes. Students should move to smaller group activities with feedback, learning the success of failure in an environment where they feel comfortable making mistakes knowing they won't be punished for it.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

1. Plan unit by unpacking standards, setting learning targets, & create assessments to measure
2. Deliver explicit instruction
3. Allow students to engage in activities to promote processing including small groups, partner discussions, or projects.
4. Teachers act as learning partners with all students, encourage self-discovery, provide support for students to pursue their passions, and create space for mistakes. Intentional focus will be placed on building relationships with the ESSA subgroups who are below proficiency level including Black, Multiracial, Economically disadvantaged, ELL and SWD.
4. Administer formative assessments and review data.
5. Plan next steps including additional full class instructional support, small group pull-outs, or opportunities to blend with future units.

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:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This subgroup, Students with Disabilities, has scored below the proficiency level of 41% for 3 years. According to the Federal Index, the SWD at Eisenhower Middle School is at a score of 28%

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

This subgroup, SWD, at Eisenhower MS will increase proficiency by 5% raising the achievement of SWD from 28% to 33%, moving a step closer towards the proficiency level of 41%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

ESE specialists will utilize walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of the plans. SALs and Administrators will monitor the learning targets, how cooperative instruction is taking place, and the results of the ongoing assessments. Progress monitoring assessments will be used to monitor student performance as a result of the targeted instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

ESE teachers will work alongside Gen Ed teachers to modify curriculum to meet student needs. Small group pull-out sessions will be planned to reteach concepts identified in formative assessments. Case managers will update and apply changes to IEPs to ensure the most accurate support systems for success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Best practice shows that ESE teachers and General education teachers should plan lessons with specific modifications as needed with the best interest of students with disabilities in mind. Teachers also need an opportunity to learn current and innovative strategies that work for SWD.

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.

1. Update IEPs for Students with Disabilities.
2. Inform teachers of SWD on their rosters and which case manager is assigned.
3. Provide common planning time for ESE teachers and Gen Ed teachers to plan lesson with modifications.
4. Provide a Least Restrictive Environment Class for small group session for reteaching concepts
5. Provide PD opportunities to meet the needs of Gen Ed teachers for strategies that work best for SWD

Person Responsible

Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

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.

-

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

-