Eisenhower Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Eisenhower Middle School

7620 OLD BIG BEND RD, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Francis, Nathan	Principal	
Demik, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Maathis, Reginald	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

-

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

-

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	160	184	441
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	140	134	294
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	29	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	170	0	350
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	157	0	325
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	162	11	230

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	123	154	391
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	105	105	235
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	117	152	394
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	144	168	444
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	46	57	116

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	123	154	391
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	105	105	235
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	117	152	394
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	144	168	444
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	46	57	116

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	49	49	38	50	50	36		
ELA Learning Gains				37			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				26			31		
Math Achievement*	28	57	56	34	36	36	35		
Math Learning Gains				42			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			28		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	31	44	49	37	52	53	32		
Social Studies Achievement*	38	66	68	54	58	58	45		
Middle School Acceleration	64	84	73	72	51	49	67		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	18	39	40	36	86	76	34		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	212
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	17	Yes	4	4
ELL	16	Yes	3	2
AMI				
ASN	48			
BLK	28	Yes	2	1
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	32	Yes	2	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	3	3
ELL	29	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	41			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			28			31	38	64			18
SWD	14			16			15	24			4	
ELL	20			11			9	24			5	18
AMI												
ASN	52			52			40				3	
BLK	26			18			22	30	46		5	
HSP	36			28			28	38	68		6	15
MUL	29			34			50	60			4	
PAC												
WHT	39			42			46	42	72		5	
FRL	29			23			25	33	63		6	20

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	38	37	26	34	42	45	37	54	72			36
SWD	19	29	22	15	33	43	14	26	50			
ELL	16	33	28	15	32	46	7	31	42			36
AMI												
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			41
MUL	45	27	8	38	37		40	44	80			
PAC												
WHT	44	42	19	47	49	54	50	56	77			
FRL	32	34	27	29	38	43	30	49	65			29

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	36	39	31	35	33	28	32	45	67			34
SWD	18	36	28	16	25	19	17	27				
ELL	20	35	31	23	28	30	23	24	75			34

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
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			41
MUL	40	37		47	32		29	58	36			
PAC												
WHT	43	39	36	46	38	31	39	59	75			
FRL	31	36	28	30	32	27	26	39	63			25

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	28%	47%	-19%	47%	-19%
08	2023 - Spring	32%	44%	-12%	47%	-15%
06	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	47%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	25%	53%	-28%	54%	-29%
07	2023 - Spring	13%	36%	-23%	48%	-35%
08	2023 - Spring	31%	57%	-26%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	30%	41%	-11%	44%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	55%	23%	50%	28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	49%	26%	48%	27%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	37%	64%	-27%	66%	-29%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

-Students in the Lowest 25 Percentile group for ELA showed the lowest performance. Multiple vacancies were unable to be filled throughout the year. This led to inconsistent content delivery to students.

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

-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. 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.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

- Match Achievement had the greatest gap from the state average. When measuring achievement levels, incoming scores are relevant. Achievement did not decline. In addition, there are multiple charter schools and district magnet schools that attract our higher achieving students.

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

-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 boy 9%. 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.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

- 35% of students have been absent 10% or more of the school year.
- Course failures in Math and ELA

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

-Planning instruction through the use of highly effective PLCs
Engaging students in active learning by utilizing small groups to differentiate.
Administering common assessments and disaggregating the results

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Eisenhower Middle School is a community of learners as we are all here to learn and grow together. At Eisenhower, all staff will encourage and reward positive student behavior with a school-wide incentive program based on the following expectations for students:
As an Eisenhower Middle School student, I will embrace the following core values.
· I am responsible
· I am respectful
· I am safe

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

We will "catch students being good" and reinforce the positive behaviors through a school-wide positive behavior incentive program. As a school, overall internal and external suspensions will decrease as a result of the behavior program.

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

To clarify the expectations in action, we will define guidelines for different school settings and routines. Teachers and staff members will "catch students being good" and reinforce the positive behaviors they see. Eisenhower Middle School staff will award students with PBIS points using an online platform to use to purchase supplies, spirit items, snacks, and special privileges.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Reginald Maathis (reginald.mathis@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS points to spend at school store once a month during lunch periods.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed. (https://www.pbis.org/)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will:

- Observe student behavior on a daily basis.
- Assign PBIS points to students who are meeting the expectations.

Person Responsible: Reginald Maathis (reginald.mathis@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

At Eisenhower, teachers will work collectively in professional learning communities to identify and address unfinished student learning. We will institute the inquiry cycle of data-driven instruction, including planning, assessment, analysis, and action to accelerate student learning.

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

Students will show increase in content assessments during progress monitoring in each learning cycle.

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

Teachers will share student data and plan during PLCs every Tuesday and which is facilitated and monitored by the SAL.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

common planning and common assessment data monitors growth and achievement according to specific learning goals and academic standards. Guided discourse directs and guides the students in a classroom talk on a specific problem.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The effectiveness of collective teacher efficacy has been validated repeatedly by research involving general education and special education students. (John Hattie) Albert Bandura defines collective efficacy as "a group's shared belief in the conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will:
- Informally assess students during instruction
-Teachers will collect and share student data during weekly PLCs

Person Responsible: Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

At Eisenhower, students will have the opportunity to actively participate in teacher-led small group instruction and cooperative learning following whole group instruction to reinforce skills and concepts.

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

Teachers will work with smaller groups of students to increase student's understanding of instructional concepts.

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

Teachers will share student data during weekly check-ins with SAL and plan according to the needs of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

· Check for understanding
· Scaffold and differentiate instruction
· Accelerate students to finish their learning
· Conduct data chats
· Present a targeted task for evidence of learning or discover misconception

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Learning science research has shown that small-group learning (when compared to competitive and individualistic learning) improves academic achievement, relationships with classmates and faculty, and promotes psychological well-being. The following summarizes these benefits, drawn from a meta-analysis of
small-group learning in The Journal on Excellence in College Teaching (Johnson et. al., 2014).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Teachers will participate in professional development to increase teacher skills with small groups.
2. Teachers will informally assess students during instruction
3. Teachers will collect and share student data during weekly PLCs

Person Responsible: Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

By When: PD - September 2023 Remainder weekly through out the year.

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

This information was taken from the FSA data which indicated that this subgroup is performing below when compared to their peers.

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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 manages will update and apply changes to IEPs to ensure the most accurate support systems for success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 samll 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)

By When: Monthly throughout the year.

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

This information was taken from the FSA data which indicated thatthis sub group is performing below when compared to their peers.

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

Students in this subgroup will increase their scores by at least 5%points this year in their progress monitoring and assessments.

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

1. ELL teachers will push-in to the classrooms to provide support and accommodations to teachers and students.
2 Students who need specialized instruction will receive extra time in pull out sessions.
3. Learning Strategies classes will be utilized among all three grade levels for remediation and progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Frameworks Instructional Model
2. Small Group instruction
3. Differentiated Instruction
4. Teaming
5. Conversation stems and conversation starters
6. Word walls
7. Cognates for the languages to assist in understanding

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategies are based on the data from previous FSA and progress monitoring data provided throughout the year. These storages have a heavy focus on acceleration to meet grade level benchmarks and work towards mastery,

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monitoring of interventions used, progress of students, and identifying students who need extra support.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Demik (jennifer.demik@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly throughout the year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

-

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

-

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

-

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

-

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

-

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

-

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

-

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

-

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
-	

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The Schoolwide Program Plan will be shared via Parent Nights and ESOL PAC meetings. SIP is posted on the school's website at https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/eisenhower.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Eisenhower will build relationships with stakeholders through consistent communication via newsletters, social media updates, and postings on the website. Parent involvement will be promoted through PTSA and family engagement opportunities. Recognition and appreciation of various stakeholders, including parents, volunteers, and other community members. Parent compact letters will be provided and posted on the school's website at https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/eisenhower.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Increased focus on positive attendance behavior, using PBIS incentives. Targeted professional development aimed at increasing teacher efficacy with small-group instruction. Data-driven professional learning communities focused on increasing teacher knowledge of their individual students. Conducting

data chats with students after progress monitoring assessments. Opportunities for students to access additional instructional opportunities include lunch and learns, tutoring before and after school, Saturday boot camps, and an extended learning program. Classroom walk-throughs to identify trends, followed by non-evaluative feedback to improve teaching and learning.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

-