

Lake County Schools

Eustis Elementary School



2019-20 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	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Eustis Elementary School

714 E CITRUS AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

<https://eel.lake.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Reanna Boardway

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Lake 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	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Eustis Elementary School

714 E CITRUS AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

<https://eel.lake.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.

The mission at Eustis Elementary is EVERY student, EVERY day, achieves high levels of learning

Provide the school's vision statement.

A safe, inclusive, and collaborative school community that has high expectations for all students, and supports, engages, and celebrates learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Voytko, Corrie	Principal	Corrie Voytko, Principal- leads the team, monitors and communicates data results to all stakeholders, attends MTSS meetings, engages in and facilitates targeted feedback cycles with leadership team, completes daily learning walks to provide non-evaluative feedback to teachers, manages regular communication with staff and community through newsletters, SchoolMessenger System, email, scheduled meetings, and social media, and serves as a Common Collaborative Planning Facilitator.
Scott, Tushena	Assistant Principal	Tushena Scott, Assistant Principal- responsible for discipline and safety, engages in targeted feedback cycles, Common Collaborative Planning Facilitator, attends MTSS meetings, completes daily learning walks and provided non-evaluative feedback to teachers.
Braswell, Leah	Other	Leah Braswell, CRT- leads Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math initiatives, School Communication (Facebook, Twitter, etc.), maintains school website, serves as Assessment Coordinator, serves as TEAM contact, manages volunteers, Common Collaborative Planning Facilitator, provides assistance to teachers, oversees parent engagement activities, and serves as Title I Contact.
Isabelle, Renee	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair, APT memberr
Wiseman, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Michelle Wiseman, Literacy Coach- serves on MTSS team, provides assistance to teachers with ELA curriculum, provide small group instruction to bottom quartile students, engages in targeted feedback cycles, and serves as a Common Collaborative Planning Facilitator.
Henry, Tammie	Other	Provides a supervised and structured environment for students assigned to the in-school suspension program, Works with classroom teachers to coordinate the academic activities of assigned students and supports students in completing assigned work along with the implementation of social, emotional learning, behavioral, and academic support.
Broadway, Charles	Instructional Coach	Math Content Specialist, provides small group instruction to bottom quartile students, common collaborative planning facilitator, manages and provides iReady support for teachers and students, MTSS member.
McKinnie, Jessica	School Counselor	Manages MTSS, ELL students, 504s, and provides counseling to students in all grade levels. Assists teachers with creating academic and behavior plans.

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	66	74	86	79	85	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	8	2	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	5	0	6	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	18	16	32	24	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148

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	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	8	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	9	9	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	8	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	9	9	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	57%	58%	57%	54%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	57%	58%	55%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	49%	53%	50%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	60%	63%	67%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	46%	56%	62%	52%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	39%	51%	50%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	54%	53%	47%	49%	51%

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	66 (0)	74 (0)	86 (0)	79 (0)	85 (0)	83 (0)	473 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (1)	11 (0)	8 (8)	2 (0)	9 (4)	16 (9)	56 (22)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	6 (1)	7 (1)	27 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (6)	0 (9)	0 (9)	0 (16)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (41)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (9)	13 (13)	18 (12)	43 (34)

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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	53%	59%	-6%	56%	-3%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
	2018	75%	65%	10%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	61%	1%	64%	-2%
	2018	63%	60%	3%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	43%	57%	-14%	60%	-17%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	56%	-15%	53%	-12%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	44	36	24	25	13	9				
ELL	48	50		48	46	30	29				
BLK	39	41	15	46	41	17	20				
HSP	54	58	31	47	39	29	35				
MUL	69			77							
WHT	69	61	75	72	51	40	56				
FRL	46	51	38	53	44	20	38				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	35	52	70	45	35						
ELL	33	67		50	47						
BLK	51	61	65	46	43	26	27				
HSP	50	60		60	43		56				
WHT	72	52	50	80	55	38	68				
FRL	59	61	57	63	46	29	53				
2017 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	28	46	41	39	30	23	25				
ELL	41	25		70	67						
BLK	34	50	50	40	29	43	32				
HSP	50	44		69	48		23				
WHT	63	59	48	79	59	53	59				
FRL	44	46	48	59	49	53	34				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Math Lower Percentile showed the lowest performance, decreasing 23 points over the last two years. Focusing on reading interventions to increase ELA performance instead of planning strategically for math may be one reason for the decline.

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

FSSA Proficiency showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Ensuring adequate time for science instruction and/or incorporating hands on activities, such as STEM activities, science experiments, etc to help students understand scientific concepts may have helped student performance.

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.

Math Lower Percentile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (-25 point gap). Fact fluency and explicit math instruction tailored to the need of each student needed to be in place to increase student performance.

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

Fourth Grade Lower Percentile Math showed the most improvement. Teachers used iReady Instructional Profile groups to provide support in deficient areas/skills. Students also were able to practice fact fluency 3 to 5 times per week and were provided differentiated instruction to help acquire skills to help understand grade level concepts.

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

Student attendance and the number of suspensions are two potential areas of concern. Our two new positions (Mental Health Liaison and Positive Alternative to School Suspension- PASS), should help lower the number of absences and referrals. Using Restorative Practice Circles and LEAPS will help students choose positive ways to deal issues.

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

1. Create fluid intervention groups to help meet the needs of every student (including Lower Percentile) to increase Math Lower Percentile from 27% to 60% and ELA Lower Percentile from 39% to 60%.
2. Plan and provide instruction with a clear purpose/goal in mind. What are we teaching? Why are we teaching it? How will I know students have learned it?/How will students know they've learned it?
3. Increase student talk. Students should be talking about learning 50% of the time.
4. Ensure there is adequate time for Science instruction. Implement Science into the ELA Block.
5. Use Restorative Practice Circles to create a positive school culture, reduce the number of student incidents and/or referrals, and increase attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title

When planning for instruction, teachers will understand purposeful instruction guided by the District's Instructional Framework.

Rationale

When planning for instruction, teachers will understand purposeful instruction guided by the District's Instructional Framework.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Increase our Learning Gains for Lowest Percentile Students in ELA from 39% to 60% and Lowest Percentile Math from 27% to 60%, also increase FSSA proficiency from 41% to 60%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Ensuring student talk makes up 50% of instructional times as evidenced by data collected from the Classroom Walkthrough Tool.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

If we ensure student talk makes up 50% of instructional time, then students will gain up to 2 years of growth (+0.82 effect size) according to John Hattie's "Visible Learning".

Action Step

Description

Students will use Accountable Talk Strategies and Stems in the classroom when discussing learning with peers. Students will be able to verbally state what they are learning, why they are learning it and how they will know they learned it.

Person Responsible

Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	To create a supportive school community, teachers and administrators will understand and implement Restorative Practices.
Rationale	If we address students' social and emotional needs, then we will provide a supportive environment for students to excel in core subjects.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decreased absences, incident reports, and referrals. Increase our Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile Students in ELA and Math to 60%, also increase FSSA proficiency to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammie Henry (henryt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use restorative circles to ensure students build positive relationships with peers and adults to create a culture of high expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we build positive relationships, then the number of absences, incident reports, and referrals will decrease and learning will increase (+0.52 effect size/up to 1 year of growth) according to John Hattie's "Visible Learning".
Action Step	
Description	1. PASS Teacher, Mental Health Liaison, Guidance Counselor, and other instructional staff will facilitate restorative circles with targeted student groups. Each identified group will meet once a week for Restorative Circles.
Person Responsible	Tammie Henry (henryt@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Teachers will form fluid differentiated intervention groups to support learners at every level based on formative assessments.
Rationale	If we form fluid differentiated intervention groups to support learners at every level, then students will receive targeted instruction and increase achievement in Lowest Quartile ELA from 39% to 60% and Lowest Quartile Math from 27% to 60%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase our Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile Students in ELA and Math to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using the common structure and data from formative assessments, we will form fluid intervention groups based on students' current needs. During intervention groups, explicit and strategic small group instruction will be provided to target deficient skills. These groups will be form using the i-Ready Instructional Grouping Profiles.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers plan intentional tasks based on data to provide interventions for students, then learning will increase (up to one year of learning or +0.47 effect size) according to John Hattie's "Visible Learning".
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use assessment data (i-Ready) and Benchmark Assessment to form intervention groups. 2. Create and establish intervention schedule with identified interventions by assigned interventionist. 3. Track progress using tools such as Heinemann's Benchmark Assessment System, Developmental Studies' SIPPS Mastery tests, and iReady diagnostics, and adjust groups based on students' needs.
Person Responsible	Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us)

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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Our goal for parent and family engagement is to have 90% of our parents attend 2 or more scheduled family engagement activities. Specific parent and family engagement opportunities will be scheduled every month beginning with Annual Title I Meeting and Curriculum night held in September. Parents will be invited to Report Card Night, Family Engagement Nights, SAC Meetings, APT Meetings, Parent Resource Room, STEAM Nights and other events via SchoolMessenger, Flyers in English and Spanish, and Notes in agendas.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Mental Health Liaison meets with students to provide LEAPS lessons, conducts group and individual counseling, collaborates with community agencies, and coordinates crises intervention and prevention.

Guidance Counselor counsels students and engages them in activities to support social and emotional well being.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

EES will have Kindergarten Round-up for parents of incoming kindergartners towards the end of the school year. During Kindergarten Round meetings will give the parents an opportunity to meet the Kindergarten teachers and other staff members. We also provide information about the curriculum and provide parents with take home activities.

Students who are going to Eustis Middle School next school year will visit EMS in May. They are taken on a tour of the school and given info on registering for electives. EMS also offers an orientation night in the spring that follows the visit so that parents have the info they need to prepare their students for middle school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Title I funds is based on Direct Certification Numbers. The funding allows us to fund personnel to assist students, resources to engage parents, and supplemental materials for academic intervention.

Title 1 Part C Migrant

Title II

Title II I ELL provides EES with funds to hire two teacher assistants that primarily work with our ELL students.

SAI funds are given to EES to assist with other supplemental services or materials we may need for our students who scored Level 1 or 2 on the ELA FSA or Math FSA. We will be using these funds to purchase supplemental intervention materials aligned to the ELA standards. We will also use the funds to purchase test prep materials aligned to the FSA assessments.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

EES has the following events on campus to help advance college and career awareness: STEAM Night, Literacy Night, DARE Program, Veterans Day Program, and various Family Engagement events.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: When planning for instruction, teachers will understand purposeful instruction guided by the District's Instructional Framework.				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To create a supportive school community, teachers and administrators will understand and implement Restorative Practices.				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Teachers will form fluid differentiated intervention groups to support learners at every level based on formative assessments.				\$4,324.04
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Eustis Elementary School	General Fund		\$3,389.04
			Notes: Developmental Studies SIPPS Materials			
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Eustis Elementary School	General Fund		\$935.00
			Notes: Heinemann Benchmark Assessment Systems (Level 1 and 2)			
Total:						\$4,324.04