Eustis Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eustis Middle School

18725 BATES AVE, Eustis, FL 32736

https://ems.lake.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Michael Spencer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: 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

Eustis Middle School

18725 BATES AVE, Eustis, FL 32736

https://ems.lake.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	84%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	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.

At Eustis Middle School, we desire to foster a safe, positive and engaging learning environment for our students, which promotes the value of an education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eustis Middle School is the home of a faculty, staff, and student body who believe in each other's willingness to grow and adapt, in order to meet the challenges faced by today's students.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crosby, Abigail	Principal	
Durias, Herman	Assistant Principal	
Alexander, Sherrita	Other	
Cassidy, Whitney	Instructional Coach	
Williams, Rhoda	Other	
Phillips, James	Assistant Principal	
Tatai, Brian	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Michael Spencer

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
21

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
32

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
54

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: 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](#).	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	234	248	235	0	0	0	0	717
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	15	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	15	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	68	112	0	0	0	0	251
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	78	84	0	0	0	0	246

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	256	275	0	0	0	0	753

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	340	327	367	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	154	146	121	0	0	0	0	421

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	110	143	0	0	0	0	360

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	52	63	0	0	0	0	183
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	11

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	340	327	367	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	45	55	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	30	24	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	30	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	146	121	0	0	0	0	421

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	256	275	0	0	0	0	753

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	45%	50%	54%	43%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	52%	54%	43%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	44%	47%	31%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	51%	56%	58%	51%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	53%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	51%	39%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	49%	51%	42%	46%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	70%	72%	66%	72%	70%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	43%	52%	-9%	54%	-11%
	2018	39%	47%	-8%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	40%	49%	-9%	52%	-12%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
	2018	48%	55%	-7%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	44%	53%	-9%	55%	-11%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	50%	58%	-8%	54%	-4%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	54%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	14%	39%	-25%	46%	-32%
	2018	27%	39%	-12%	45%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	41%	49%	-8%	48%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	51%	0%	50%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	71%	-11%	71%	-11%
2018	67%	70%	-3%	71%	-4%
Compare		-7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	52%	38%	61%	29%
2018	92%	62%	30%	62%	30%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	18	31	27	23	37	36	19	38			
ELL	12	30	32	27	40	47	10	47			

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
BLK	35	40	35	35	44	34	33	44	74		
HSP	37	45	40	44	49	40	36	58	80		
MUL	58	50		51	56			81	93		
WHT	53	47	40	62	54	36	52	69	79		
FRL	37	43	39	43	47	38	33	53	70		

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	16	33	29	21	39	40	20	43			
ELL	15	55	55	26	43	32		50			
BLK	32	46	40	38	49	34	24	76	77		
HSP	42	53	52	51	62	56	58	55	65		
MUL	54	48		56	69	70	69	82			
WHT	53	53	36	64	65	48	59	72	82		
FRL	39	48	42	49	57	47	44	64	72		

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	9	28	28	15	34	28	11	37			
ELL	7	27	26	7	26	36					
BLK	29	36	26	34	50	42	20	46	65		
HSP	34	36	29	40	42	35	29	63	73		
MUL	43	32	36	46	46	15	18	75	75		
WHT	51	49	35	63	60	41	55	73	72		
FRL	34	38	32	41	49	39	29	60	75		

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	52
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	50
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	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
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	47
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.

The lowest performing subgroups at Eustis Middle School were students with disabilities (SWD) and those students that are considered to be English language learners (ELLs). Specifically, there was a significant drop in ELA lowest quartile of ELLs making learning gains from the year prior dropping from 55% to 32% .There are multiple factors that may have contributed to the lack of performance within these subgroups, including a lack of pre-requisite skills in core subject areas, frequent absenteeism, and/or the inconsistent use of common planning specifically for teachers within these subgroup areas.

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

The greatest decline from the 2019-2020 school year data was in the area of lower quartile learning gains. The lower quartile may consist of those students that rare also classified as students with capabilities and/or students that are English language learners. There are multiple factors that may have contributed to the lack of performance within the lowest quartile including an additional factor may have been the time and efforts utilized on implementing a new curriculum for ELA during the 2018-2019 school year. Also, including a lack of pre-requite skills in core subject areas, frequent absenteeism, and/or the inconsistent use of common planning specifically for teachers within these subgroup areas.

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.

When compared to the state average, Eustis Middle School's greatest achievement gap exists in the area of math learning gains among the students within the lower quartile. The state average was 51%, while Eustis Middle's average was 37%. While multiple factors may have contributed to the lack of performance in this area, including a lack of pre-requisite skills in this subject area, an additional factor may have been the time and efforts utilized on implementing a new curriculum for ELA during the 2018-2019 school year.

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

The area that showed the most improvement according to the data is the area of acceleration. The 2019-20 school year offered weekly before school tutoring, common planning times, and IXL Math. For the 2020-2021 school year, Geometry will be included again and all math classes will be supported with a new ALEKS math software program.

EMS LSA 2019-2020 data shows the same trend with our Algebra averaging eight points above the district average.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

EWS data shows a concern in the areas of one or more suspensions and level 1 on statewide assessments in Math and ELA. Suspension concerns will be addressed this school year through the use of Mustang Connect and the Positive Alternatives to School Suspension programs. Although Eustis Middle School is trending in a positive direction, down from 124 2018-2019 school year to 92 in the 2019-2020 school year, this will continue to be an area of focus.

For the 2018-2019 school year Eustis Middle School FSA scores for Level 1 were 246 Math and 251 ELA making this a large area of focus for the 2020-2021 school year.

Our ESE LSA data for the 2019-2020 school year from quarter 1 and quarter 3 shows that ESE continues to be an area of concern, falling below the district average for the majority of all subjects across all grade levels excluding algebra.

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

1. Lowest quartile learning gains through data-driven, standards-based instruction, MTSS, and small group instruction.
2. Students with disabilities and English language learners (ELL) subgroups through support facilitation, ELL support staff, and utilizing X-Block (remediation) to provide students with support.
3. Decrease the amount of suspensions through PBIS utilizing quarterly incentives to keep students in class.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focused data-driven standards-based instruction with purpose. Eustis Middle School will implement data driven, standards-based, focused on student learning and authentic literacy that is interesting and relevant for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Overall student achievement will increase by 4% and to target the lowest 25th percentile in math and ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Abigail Crosby (crosbya@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monthly common planning for consistent student data analysis. Teacher will incorporate strategies specifically to target the standards that students did not master proficiently.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Monthly common planning will allow teachers to analyze data from common assessments, quarterly LSA data, and students with EWS. Teachers utilizing strategies specifically to target the standards that students have not met will include; using google classroom for informal and formal assessments to get feedback quicker to students, collaboration between students using google classrooms to suffice for social distancing, and teachers performing learning walks on expert teachers. These strategies will increase overall student achievement by focusing on student learning utilizing lessons with purpose through teachers effectively modeling in the classroom, authentic literacy, and exploring opportunities for collaborative learning to practice to deepen students' knowledge. Collaboration and small group instruction to promote student engagement will be used in every classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will commit to a minimum of 3 common planning days per year, in addition to team meetings and grade-level PLC's.
2. Common planning days will be included in additional writing teams where teachers can come in twice a month on Saturdays to develop data driven lesson plans.
2. An administrator will attend each common planning day to discuss and analyze quarterly data.
3. Following planning days, data-driven lessons will be created by teachers and will be included, implemented, and monitored for improvement in achievement.
4. Purchase classroom furniture such as science lab tables and flat-topped student desks to foster collaboration and student engagement through SAC budget.

Person Responsible	Abigail Crosby (crosbya@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Maintain a positive school culture by monitoring EWS Data. Eustis Middle School will increase positive student behaviors, attendance, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students, including those new to Eustis Middle School, which will result in increased opportunities for standards-based instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease Level 1 students on statewide assessments by 10% and decrease students with one or more suspensions by 15%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Herman Durias (duriash@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Eustis Middle School will utilize the newly-implemented PBIS to promote positive behaviors and limit suspensions. This program will offer tutoring before and after school, utilizing X-Block to provide students with intervention support, and quarterly incentives to boost positive behaviors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By building positive student and staff relationships through PBIS, students will increase the utilization of student agendas, participate in cross-curricular teacher and student connections based on student-centered learning, and foster accountability with progress monitoring with students through monthly data chats.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff survey for PBIS needs to create teacher buy-in.
2. Plan, organize, and implement PBIS quarterly incentive programs followed with an end of year positive behavior celebration.
3. Develop and monitor a discipline data plan for tracking
4. Develop and monitor our lowest quartile student list for tracking and reporting improvements on LSA achievement data with our Potential specialist.
5. Continue communication of progress with all stakeholders through school website, social media, SAC, and yearly meetings.

Person Responsible James Phillips (phillipsj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase student achievement by using MTSS. By using various forms of data, Eustis Middle School increase achievement by implementing and monitoring a system for all students, specifically targeting those students in the lower quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student achievement within the lower quartile subgroups by 4% with a focus on students with disability and English Language Learners.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Herman Durias (duriash@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the Multi-tiered Systems of support (MTSS) and lower quartile remediation/ tutoring, the leadership and faculty will incorporate tiered interventions for students in need, including the use of ALEKS math software program, Achieve 3000 for reading intervention, one-to-one Chromebooks and technology (interactive TVS from SAI budget) for supplemental support, small-group instruction by content area coaching and leadership team, PBIS meetings, and monthly MTSS meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to target the lowest quartile of students and enhance student achievement we will implement the following: differentiated instruction, flexible grouping, and making lessons relevant and engaging for all students. In addition, we will consistently analyze student achievement and EWS data to improve learning gains in the lowest quartile with a specific focus on our ELL and ESE subgroups. In addition we will be supplementing each of our three civics classrooms and three science classes with interactive TVs from our SAI budget. This technology will help improve the scores of students scoring in level 1 and level 2 by helping our visual learners who are able to learn better by seeing visual cues and watching more videos that pertains to the standards that they are learning and authentic literacy across different subjects.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule Monthly MTSS meetings and department data chats.
2. Engage in data chats during leadership meetings, team meetings, and common planning.
3. Specifically targeting our ELL and ESE subgroups with small-group instruction and content-area coaches and leadership support.
4. Tutoring with selected teachers targeting our lowest quartile of students.
5. Continue to increase technology for our lowest quartile with adding more interactive TVs from SAI budget.

Person Responsible Sherrita Alexander (alexanders@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This will focus on capacity building here at EMS with having five instructional leaders who are working on becoming aspiring administrators. Our potential specialist will be focused on our lowest quartile of students and our Social studies department chair. Our MTSS coordinator will be monitoring all students receiving interventions, coordinating several school wide events, and creating a tutoring schedule. Our instructional dean, will be focusing on our ESE population which was one of our targeted areas to improve. He will be leading various lesson with the PASS program based on remediation and character development. Our other two are teachers (math and Intensive reading) on campus who will be allotted several days to help out with administrative tasks.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase math proficiency, learning gains, and lowest quartile making learning gains by 4% in each category. Also, Increase lowest quartile ELA proficiency, learning gains, and lowest quartile making learning gains by 4% in each category. In addition, decrease Level 1 students on statewide assessments by 10% and decrease students with one or more suspensions by 15%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Capacity building assigned to all administrators to help develop and build up our instructional leadership teams. Instructional leaders will be given real world authentic learning experiences that build competencies to the Florida Leadership Standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The instructional leadership team will be offering a variety of ways to boost student achievement. First, they will all play several roles with mustang university which is our new teacher induction program. Second, the PBIS instructional team will focus on reducing unwanted behaviors and keeping students in class. Third, data chats from our potential specialist will analyze trends and gaps during PLC meetings with teachers. Last, our two teachers will be given several sub days to walk a day as an administrator with handling the day to day operations, conduct learning walks, and practice with fulfilling administrative tasks.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Create the aspiring administrators group and hold monthly meetings.
2) Allow each member to work with several teams for leadership opportunities; PBIS, Mustang University, data chats, PSAT/LSA testing, and learning walks.
3) Meet with an administrator 3 times a year individually to monitor each member's progress.

Person Responsible	James Phillips (phillipsj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Eustis Middle School will look to add needed classroom furniture to maximize student collaboration spaces and engagement in authentic literacy across all subjects.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Eustis Middle School (EMS) builds a positive school culture and environment ensuring that all stakeholders are involved in numerous ways. First, our Student Advisory Committee (SAC) is a committee with many stakeholders including parents, community members, teachers, administrators, and other school staff members. Our SAC is open to any stakeholder and offers monthly meetings where input is gathered and school decisions are discussed and voted on. Second, EMS hosts several family nights throughout the year such as Science Night, Open House, 6th grade orientation, Mustang Round-up, and Title 1 family engagement nights. The administrative/leadership teams also meets with Kiwanis Club, the city manager, Lake Cares, and other key community members throughout the school year. Third, EMS will be utilizing a positive behavior intervention support (PBIS) team to continue to "welcome home" our EMS students with hosting such events as quarterly behavior incentive programs and capping off the year with a celebration acknowledging these students for exhibiting these positive behaviors. Finally, To meet the needs of all students, EMS also has helpful bilingual staff members and trained professionals in ESOL that are available to assist with communication, along with a leadership team to help the parents of our students with disabilities.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00