

Pinellas County Schools

Eisenhower Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Eisenhower Elementary School

2800 DREW ST, Clearwater, FL 33759

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

Demographics

Principal: Antonette Wilson L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2018-19 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Eisenhower Elementary achieves success by providing a respectful community with high expectations and student centered instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement

Growing tomorrow's leaders today.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Painter , Sarah	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Ku, Christen	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Wilson, Antonette	Principal
Principal	
Devine, Kristina	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Wisowaty, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Smith, Judith	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Bennett, Tammi	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	46	92	94	101	91	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
Attendance below 90 percent	1	16	16	17	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	32	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	7	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	29	29	30	22	29	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	38	46	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	8	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	54%	57%	40%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	59%	58%	46%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	54%	53%	50%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	54%	61%	63%	43%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	67%	61%	62%	43%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	48%	51%	26%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	45%	53%	53%	44%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	46 (0)	92 (0)	94 (0)	101 (0)	91 (0)	123 (0)	547 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	16 ()	16 ()	17 ()	10 ()	16 ()	76 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	32 (0)	48 (0)	85 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	34%	56%	-22%	58%	-24%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
	2018	30%	51%	-21%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
	2018	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	54%	60%	-6%	60%	-6%
	2018	44%	61%	-17%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data											
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	24	33	26	42	50	9				
ELL	34	60	65	53	76	70	29				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	25	33	27	35	40					
ELL	25	35	45	33	40	30	26				
BLK	37	41		27	30	20	39				
HSP	31	45	54	39	37	28	35				
MUL	38	50		48	64						
WHT	59	47		58	56		76				
FRL	37	42	49	41	43	29	40				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58

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
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	47
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	60
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	67
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA in grades 3-5 showed the lowest performance measured on the 2019 FSA. The contributing factor timing of assessment and the correct usage of strategies in reading. Providing specific behaviors and understandings that are required at each level of reading in order for scholars to demonstrate thinking within, beyond, and about the text in order to them effectively read and understand the text.

Students with disabilities in ELA. Contributing factor lack exposure to grade level text with complexity with effective strategies to use to "break" apart the text to help with understanding of text to answer text dependent questions and respond to writing prompts. Exposing or giving scholars the right tools/strategies for appropriate text.

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

3rd Grade ELA. Timing and providing specific behaviors and understandings that are required at each level for students to demonstrate thinking within, beyond, and about the text. These behaviors and understandings describe what students will be expected to do in order to effectively read and understand the text.

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

3rd and 5th Grade ELA and 4th Grade Math.

3rd and 5th grade ELA. Teaching the appropriate strategies to tackle grade level text in order to comprehend and answer text dependent questions. Strand data indicates that in Key Ideas and Details only 10 % 3rd and 12% in 5th answered question related to key ideas and details at 70% or higher. Craft and structure percentages were 31% in 3rd and 50% in 5th. Integration of knowledge 10% in 3rd and 24% in 5th. The gaps are created yearly by previous grade level gaps in comprehending grade level text.

4th Grade Math. We used more resources to support ELA. Our curriculum resources at that time did not offer different resources to differentiate the content to help address the mathematical gaps in scholars in order to effectively address the area on need in remediation and enrichment.

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

4th Grade ELA

When we observed scholars growth from Fall to Winter in MAP in Reading we made adjustments to ELA Core. Selected teaches purposefully planned with the Literacy Coach on standards and text to use to teach the standard at grade level but in smaller groups, different scaffolding, and use of strategies. Groups were taught by classroom teachers, ELL, ESE, and Literacy Coach.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance: Child Study Team will put incentive's and strategies in place for attendance during the 2019 2020 school year.

Level 1 on Statewide Assessments: Keen focus on planning and teaching the standards and using data to adjust to each scholars needed will help decrease the number of Level 1 o Statewide Assessments.

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

1. Standards Base Planning
2. Standards Base Instruction
3. Formative Assessment
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA/Reading Goal
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 46% as evidenced by 2019 FSA Scores. We expect our performance level to be 51% or Higher by June 2019. The problem/gap is occurring because inconsistency in planning and instruction as well as follow up in data reflection. If self -reflection of practices would occur, the problem would be reduced by a demonstration of more purposeful planning, responsiveness to individual data, and increased student proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students making academic gain in ELA will increase from 46% to 51%, as measured by June 2020 FSA Data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for these strategies rest upon the ELA Shifts. Complexity: Practice regularly with complex text and its academic language. Evidence: Ground reading, writing, and speaking in evidence from text, both literary and informational. Knowledge: Build knowledge through content-rich nonfiction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	FSA Data reflects ELA Overall Proficiency is below 50%. White and multiracial scholars are the only subgroup performing above 50%

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional Staff will intentionally design lessons on the trajectory of difficulty with multiple checkpoints to find out what students know and scaffold or differentiate instruction to meet the student’s needs. With the usage of "data mining" plans will align instruction to meet the Florida Standards for ELA, by providing multiple opportunities across the literacy block for reading, writing, speaking, and listening 2. Incorporate the usage of multiple instructional strategies such as The Thinking Maps, Graphic Organizers, Repertoire Lessons. 3. Instructional staff will monitor and provide feed forward feedback that supports students growth towards proficiency daily and mastery of the standard. 4. Instructional staff will provide daily independent reading with accountability including teachers conferring with students to provide individualized instruction. 5. AVID Core Strategy: Organizing Materials. 6. Administration will monitor through walkthroughs and provide targetable actionable feedback.
--------------------	---

7. Utilize the MPI's to differentiate instruction based on the students language of language proficiency using the Candle descriptors.

**Person
Responsible**

Tammi Bennett (bennetta@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 54% of scholars proficient as evidenced by 2019 FSA Scores. We expect our performance level to be 60% by June 2019 FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because of textbook dependency and lack of differentiated math instruction to reach all levels of learners. If intentional focus on unit data and effective utilization of district-provided resources would occur, the problem would be reduced by understanding how to use the provided resources including content area coaches to dress learners gaps and misconceptions.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students making academic gains in Math will increase from 54%% to 60%, as measured by 2019 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Shifts of mathematical practices: Focus strongly where the standards focus. Coherence: Think across grades and link to major topics within grades. Rigor: In major topics, pursue conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application with equal intensity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources and strengthen staff ability to engage scholars in complex tasks. Uses multiple approaches to consistently monitor scholars' understanding of instruction, directions, procedures, processes, questions, and content. Data indicates that our black and SWD scholars are performing below 50% proficiency. Our white, Hispanic, ELL, and multiracial scholars are performing above 50% proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Empower mathematics teacher leaders to create and sustain a culture of feedback and openness, including ongoing teacher to teacher feedback, learning walks, etc. For example, using the Coached Observation Protocol. 2. Ensure feedback, professional development, and PLCs align with the Key Shifts in Mathematics [Focus, Coherence, Rigor] and promote strong alignment between standard, target, and task. 3. Utilize multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction, including Unit Assessments, Exit Tickets, MFAS and Illustrative Mathematics tasks, and/or "in the moment" student work analysis. Use student work to guide analysis of student learning in grade level PLCs. 4. AVID Core Strategy: Organizing Materials. 5.
Person Responsible	Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 45% proficient , as evidenced by our SSA Score. We expect our performance level to be 52% by June 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of resources and low priority of science concepts and instructional routines in all grade levels. If more intentional pairing of SLAGS to instructional routines and formative assessment strategies would occur, the problem would be reduced by increased background and prerequisite knowledge and instructional rigor for the students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of 5th grade scholars achieving science proficiency will increase from 45% to 52%, as measured by SSA Scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources through monthly PD and PLC's led by district science coaches to make science concepts more culturally relevant. Build more connections for Black, Hispanic, ELL, SWD, scholars.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Trend data show that ELL, Hispanic, Black, and SWD scholars show science proficiency levels in the 30's while white scholars are in the 60's.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gamify learning and present more real world concepts. 2. Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment. 3. Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key content. 4. Provide students with the criteria and standards for successful task completion. Provide multiple opportunities to use effective feedback to revise and resubmit work for evaluation against the standard. 5. Support the 5E instructional model through identification and understanding of each component [Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate] as identified in each elementary science unit grades 1- 5. 6. AVID Core Strategy: Organizing Materials. 7. Additional support for planning will be provided by Just in Time science coach specifically for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade.
Person Responsible	Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging The Gap
Rationale	<p>Our current level of performance is 47% Proficient in ELA, 45% Proficient in Math (which is an increase from the previous year), as evidenced by 2019 FSA Scores.</p> <p>We expect our performance level to be at 55% Proficient in ELA and Math by FSA 2020 Scores.</p> <p>The problem/gap is occurring because consistent teaching of high expectations with more empathy and less sympathy.</p> <p>If all instructional staff became intentionally mindful and responsive of students cultural backgrounds and academic abilities. Then instruction would be designed around their prior experiences, their interest, and their individual needs and 50% or more of our black students would become proficient in ELA, Math, and Science</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of black students proficiency in ELA and Math will increase from 47% ELA to 55% and from 45% Math 50% proficiency as measured by 2020 FSA Scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increase in black student’s positive and intellectual participation in the classroom setting connected to improved student achievement and positive self-confidence will result in improved proficiency as evidenced by the FSA improvement data from 2018 to 2019 with only 50% of staff intentionally using restorative circles and culturally relevant teaching practices in their classrooms.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Admin Team Present Equity for All and BTG PD during Preschool of August 2019. 2. Equity Champions present learning modules 3. Teachers clearly, logically, and concisely-scaffolding learning and thinking strategies, address, misconceptions. 4. Teachers intentionally planing and implementing CRT Strategies. Monitor lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that engage black students in rigorous, standards based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting back learners. 5. Helping students feel valued and respected-maintaining classroom environments, genuine interest in student ideas, courtesy and respect in all interactions, quality work displayed with reflections, specific praise/feedback. 6. AVID Core Strategy: Organizing Materials.

7. Teachers will implement mathematical mindset lessons that is embedded into the curriculum for the first 13 days.

Person Responsible Tammi Bennett (bennettta@pcsb.org)

#5

Title Conditions for Learning

Rationale If the academic, social-emotional and behavioral needs of each and every scholar is known and met that we will have equity and excellence for ALL at Eisenhower ES.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 75% of the 13 office referrals were written for black scholars. We expect our performance level to be less than 13 referrals and less than 10% black by June of 2020. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because of inconsistent culturally responsive instruction which is not adequately bridging the equity gap. This includes staff members inability (lack of know how) to connect professional development that is centered around Culturally Relevant Teaching, Restorative Practices, and Equity to relationships and achievement which impacts behavior for Tier 2 and 3 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

Equity Champions will present three staff learning modules created by PCS as well as support the learning modules. Restorative Practices lead will conduct monthly school wide review of Tier 1 and Restorative Practices implementation. Administration will monitor: Equity Mindsets, Culturally Relevant teaching, and PBIS Restorative Practices SEL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Our discipline data shows that one of our sub groups are responsible for the majority of the written referrals. Our academic data show that less than 41% of our SWD are performing at a proficient level. When we turn our intentional attention to Equity and Excellence for all through our mindsets, teaching, and practices we will see a decrease referrals for our black subgroup and an increase in proficiency with in our SWD subgroup.

Action Step

Description

1. Support the implementation of all staff learning modules.
2. Implement restorative circles in 100% of classroom with administration monitoring.
3. Use and share AVID CRT Classroom Audit self reflections to support school and classroom practices.
4. Use and monitor CRT strategies in the classroom daily.
5. AVID Core Strategy: Organizing Materials.

Person Responsible

Judith Smith (smithjudithj@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	<p>Our current attendance rate is 20%. We expect our performance level to be 10% by May 2020</p> <p>The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because the inconsistent follow through on the why the absences are occurring. As well as when students move out of the county/state the process to withdraw when there is no evidence of re-enrollment is not approved until the process is followed and that can take months as it impacts attendance rate. Follow up as to why the absence occurred has to begin with the teacher and immediate confirmation with the Social Worker and Child Study Team.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Scholars missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 179 appx. 20% to 10% of scholars missing school as evidenced by attendance dashboard data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Monitor the attendance flow chart after the 1st absence. Initiate paperwork for withdrawing students who have left the district/state in a timely manner.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If and when the flowchart is followed with fidelity by the classroom teacher, Social Worker, and the Child Study team then their will be a decrease in the absence rate of students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When and where appropriate create a Student Attendance Success Plan which will be designed to help parents track their children’s attendance and work with teachers to set appropriate goals. 2. Select staff members to serve as "mentors," identified scholars will report to the mentor in a classroom (or other predetermined location) immediately upon arriving to school and will "check in" 3. Review attendance taking process with school staff. 4. Communicate with parents via phone call and newsletters on the importance of attending school. 5. Plan monthly Panda Celebration to recognize students with improved attendance.
Person Responsible	Judith Smith (smithjudithj@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family,&Community Engagement
Rationale	Increase family engagement and communication efforts throughout the 2019-2020 school year. With a focus on educating parents on their student current level of performance and end of year expectations. The Road Map to Success.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Eisenhower staff will engage parents and family members in regular, two-way, and meaningful communication involving scholars academic learning and other school activities. Include ways to ensure that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Effectively communicate with families about their scholars' progress and school processes/practices. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their scholars academically, socially, and behaviorally by providing academic tools to families in support of their scholars achievement at home.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	During the 2018-2019 school Eisenhower's data states that 13 referrals were written, 76 scholars had an attendance rates blow 90%, 21 scholars had 2 or more Early Warning Indicators, and 85 scholars in grades 3-5 scored a level 1 on FSA. Ongoing research shows that family engagement in schools improves student achievement, reduces absenteeism, and restores parents' confidence in their children's education. Therefore we will intentionally involve our families in an effort to improve of school wide data as it relates to behavior, academics, and attendance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Family Nights at each grade level to discuss student academic, social, and behavioral progress, goals, and available resources as needed by families. Will included take home resources. 2. Utilize student services to provide families/parents, and students with resources, tools, triage support, outside agencies referrals. 3. Utilize current programs to gather parents and family input for development of school improvement. (All Pro Dads, International Coffee Talks, SAC, PTA) 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 4 out of the 6 modules in bronze, as evidenced in the Alliance for Healthier Generations, Healthy Schools Program Framework. We expect our performance level to be 6 out of the 6 modules eligible for bronze/silver/gold by May 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Re-Assess Healthy School Team to ensure it is made up of a minimum of 4 individuals including but not limited to: PE Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, and Student. We the Healthy School Team complete the Healthy School Program Assessment in order to maintain bronze level and obtain silver or gold status.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Wiszowaty (wiszowaty@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Healthy School Program Training for staff during the month of August Healthy School Assessment Training: Developing and Implementing an Action Plan
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We selected these strategies because it is our goal to become a healthier school and to obtain silver or gold status.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attend district supported professional development. 2. Complete the SMART Snacks in School Documentation. 3. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and Apply for Recognition. 4. Communicate Wellness Wednesday updates to staff weekly. 5. Implement farm to table program using our Site based garden and incorporating into our Healthy Bodies, Healthy Minds family involvement event.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Wiszowaty (wiszowaty@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 12% proficient in ELA, and 26% proficient in Math, as evidenced by FSA 2019 Scores .We expect our performance level to be 51% proficient in ELA and 51% in Math by FSA 2020 Scores. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of embedded metacognitive strategies into content based instruction and use of evidence based practices to teach foundation skills as a pathway to grade level standards. The ability to provide specific behaviors and understandings that are required at each level for students to demonstrate thinking in reading and mathematics. If ESE students are consistently taught using strategies that help them gain access to grade level content frequently and constantly, then ESE students proficiency will improve in ELA, Math, and Science.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of ESE students achieving ELA and Math proficiency will increase from 12% ELA, and 26% in Math to 51% in ELA and Math as measured by 2019 FSA Scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). Ensure that students requiring ESE services receive instruction designed to teach students to advocate for their academic, social and emotional needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our ESE students proficiency level in ELA decreased by 10% points in ELA and in math increased by 1%.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop an understanding of the demands of texts on readers and implement needed strategies. 2. Ground reading, writing, and speaking in evidence from text, both literary and informational. 3. Practice regularly with complex text and its academic language. 4. Focus strongly where the standards focus in ELA and Math in a collaborative effort with ESE and general ed teachers to include collaborative teaching to differentiate instruction. 5. In major topics, pursue conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application with equal intensity. 6. Use assistive technology to support students, including speech to text, colored overlays, etc. Assistive technology team from the district will support ESE teachers.
--------------------	---

Person Responsible Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Remaining schoolwide improvement priorities will be addressed as they arise following district data and schoolwide initiatives.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA/Reading Goal				\$600.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$600.00	
<i>Notes: PD in the area of Literacy and Writing Interpreting and planning with data.</i>						
6300	120-Classroom Teachers	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00	
<i>Notes: Planning for instruction and student lesson. Analyzing data and planning next steps.</i>						
6300		1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School			\$0.00	
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Mathematics				\$1,100.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
6300	120-Classroom Teachers	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00	
<i>Notes: Unit planning and assessment creation.</i>						
6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00	
<i>Notes: PD on math concepts and classroom strategies implementation.</i>						
6400	120-Classroom Teachers	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$300.00	
<i>Notes: PD on math concepts and classroom strategies implementation.</i>						
6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School			\$300.00	
<i>Notes: Pd and planning of mathematical concepts and implementation.</i>						
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science				\$300.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$300.00	
<i>Notes: Planning of science instruction K-5</i>							
	6300	140-Substitute Teachers	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00	
<i>Notes: Planning of science instruction K-5 Interpreting Data</i>							
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging The Gap					\$600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
			1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$200.00	
<i>Notes: PD in the area of Equity for All. Cultural Relevant Teaching Practices, PBIS, and Restorative Practices.</i>							
			1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$300.00	
<i>Notes: PD in the area of Equity for All. Cultural Relevant Teaching Practices, PBIS, and Restorative Practices.</i>							
	5000	510-Supplies	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$100.00	
<i>Notes: AVID Organizational Materials.</i>							
			1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School			\$0.00	
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning					\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance					\$0.00
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family, & Community Engagement					\$100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	6150	510-Supplies	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$100.00	
<i>Notes: Materials for parents to participate in activities that they can us at home with scholars.</i>							
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools					\$200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$200.00	

			<i>Notes: Provided healthy resources in the area of food, nutrition, exercise, and stress management.</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1131 - Eisenhower Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Provided healthy resources in the area of food, nutrition, exercise, and stress management.</i>			
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities (SWD)				\$0.00
					Total:	\$2,900.00