Eustis High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eustis High School

1300 E WASHINGTON AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

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

Demographics

Principal: Tracy Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
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 (52%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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 High School

1300 E WASHINGTON AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

https://ehs.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)
High School 9-12	No	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

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.

"The mission of Eustis High School is to lead and encourage every student to become educated, respectful, contributing members of their communities."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"The vision for Eustis High School is to become a culture where everyone is connected and actively engaged in the learning process."

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
Clark, Tracy	Principal	The EHS principal is responsible for: Student learning results; student learning as a priority; instructional leadership; instructional plan implementation utilizing the district instructional framework;; developing and promoting a positive school culture; promoting the district and school mission/vision; faculty development; learning environment; organizational leadership; leadership development; communication between staff, students, and the community; ethical and professional behavior of the staff; and leading the Leadership Team in a collaborative environment.
Caldwell, Lamica	Assistant Principal	11th grade administrator; attendance office; field trips; health coordinator; lead for safety and security; teacher development, teacher evaluations, and learning walks.
Zimmerman, Andrew	Assistant Principal	10th grade administrator; graduation team; SIP; AVID; Athletics; curriculum; Edgenuity; new teacher induction; facilities care and repair; fundraisers; club applications; club and department budgets; student parking; SAC liaison; custodians; teacher development, teacher evaluations, and learning walks.
Colarossi, Karen	Instructional Coach	Promoting reading; MTSS; student achievement teams; 9th and 10th grade appropriate strategies and interventions; graduation team; classroom learning walks; Reading department chairperson; SAC member; attendance team; and new teacher induction.
Steele, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	10th grade ELA teacher; ELA department chairperson; and new teacher induction team.
Hay, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Graduation Resource Facilitator; CTE department chairperson; Athletic Director; new teacher induction team.
Porter, Olivia	Teacher, K-12	Social studies teacher; AP teacher; Social Studies department chairperson; and new teacher induction team.
DeMarco, James	School Counselor	12th grade guidance counselor; guidance department chairperson; and graduation team member
Driggers, Erica	Assistant Principal	12th grade administrator; AP program; buses and transportation; guidance; master schedule; safety drills; student government; technology; testing coordinator; textbooks; teacher development, teacher evaluations, and learning walks.
Strem, Ryan	Assistant Principal	9th grade administrator; all AP duties on the Curtright Campus; attendance office; field trips; health coordinator; lead for safety and security; curriculum; facilities care and repair; buses; custodians;teacher development, teacher evaluations, and learning walks.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Neal, Shannon	Teacher, ESE	ESE specialist; and ESE department chairperson.
Milsap, Lakeshia	Teacher, K-12	9th grade science teacher; and science department chairperson.
Menzie, Tamara	Teacher, K-12	Foreign language teacher; swim coach; and electives department chairperson.
Morey, Joie	Teacher, K-12	Geometry teacher; and math department chairperson.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/24/2020, Tracy Clark

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.*
1

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
12

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
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 (52%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	330	299	315	334	1278
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	53	55	52	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	21	17	15	73
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	29	38	8	129
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	29	38	8	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	63	72	104	328
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	119	81	206

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199	241	236	221	897

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	3	15

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/24/2020

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	0	0	0	318	365	340	310	1333
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	47	46	25	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	28	23	23	126
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	56	56	3	198
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	76	70	41	280

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	127	118	98	456

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	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	6	24

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	0	0	0	318	365	340	310	1333
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	47	46	25	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	28	23	23	126
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	56	56	3	198
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	76	70	41	280

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	127	118	98	456

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	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	6	24

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	49%	50%	56%	45%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	46%	51%	45%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	33%	42%	40%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	35%	44%	51%	41%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	41%	45%	48%	44%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	36%	45%	37%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	68%	68%	51%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	69%	73%	68%	69%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
09	2019	45%	47%	-2%	55%	-10%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	48%	48%	0%	53%	-5%
	2018	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	66%	6%	67%	5%
2018	50%	61%	-11%	65%	-15%
Compare		22%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	67%	-2%	70%	-5%
2018	65%	69%	-4%	68%	-3%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	18%	52%	-34%	61%	-43%
2018	39%	62%	-23%	62%	-23%
Compare		-21%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	49%	1%	57%	-7%
2018	56%	50%	6%	56%	0%
Compare		-6%			

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	26	33	23	19	38	45	62	51		76	7
ELL	15	33	27	11	36						
BLK	32	33	16	20	26	25	78	38		87	27
HSP	45	55	50	32	43	53	67	54		87	61
MUL	43	48		37	44			92		90	
WHT	56	53	34	43	47	45	77	79		88	54
FRL	38	43	26	27	38	38	63	57		85	33
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	25	53	47	33	47	42	29	38		61	5
ELL											
BLK	29	40	43	40	45	33	35	46		79	37
HSP	31	42	38	37	50	29	39	67		80	52
MUL	55	65		42			45				
WHT	58	48	63	68	67	55	61	70		80	56
FRL	37	45	48	48	55	37	43	57		74	41
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	8	28	26	14	38	29	13	19		49	14
BLK	19	38	42	19	34	38	26	29		72	27
HSP	41	39	29	38	43	43	47	57		75	42
MUL	45	23		39	48		55			80	
WHT	53	50	51	48	47	35	60	81		81	52
FRL	32	40	38	29	38	39	37	49		69	41

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	577
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	59
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	58
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.

ELL students were the lowest-performing sub-group of students. Contributing factors include: limited English proficiency remains a substantial barrier to academic success; students become discouraged when they can not communicate what they need which leads to low self-esteem and a lack of motivation; students must work twice as hard as their peers to keep up with learning, lessons, and assignments.

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

SWD showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Contributing factors include: insufficient allocations for ESE support, the need for more effective placement of qualified teachers; insufficient common planning and collaboration; student high absentee rates; and teacher attrition.

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 achievement showed the greatest gap. Prior year high stakes testing was low and with a large increase in Algebra 1 student 1st-time takers in testing - we expected math achievement scores to decline. Remediation efforts across all math classes continues to develop and grow.

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

Science showed the greatest overall improvement. The biology teachers were consistent in implementing their common planning efforts and teaching only Biology Honors, thus raising the level of expectation for all students.

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

Improvement is needed with our ELA and Math instructional planning, implementation of instruction, and formative assessments, especially in our SWD, ELL, and AA subgroups.

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

1. Improve math achievement
2. Improve ELA achievement
3. Improve lower quartile achievement
4. Improve SWD and ELL sub-group achievement
5. Improve AA sub-group achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lake County Schools established and supports a common vision through strong instruction, grade-appropriate assignments, deep engagement, and high expectations. Each day students are to be given multiple opportunities to read, write, think, and talk through authentic literacy. The instructional practice strategies will be establishing purpose, modeling thinking, guided instruction, independent learning, and collaborative learning. With this framework, all students will be able to make improvements in achievement level and learning gains in ELA courses. The most recent school data shows that our lowest quartile level of success decreased from 49% of the students to 33% of the students.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to exceed the 51% statewide learning gains and 56% statewide achievement level for all students. ELA learning gains improvement will require a minimum of 3 percentage points growth and achievement level will require a minimum 8 percentage points growth. Our lowest quartile students will improve from 33% to greater than 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize the District Instructional Framework (for planning, instruction, and learning) where the teacher is the facilitator of providing structure and opportunities each day to practice reading and writing. The teacher will provide purpose for the lesson and model what learning looks like to make the connection with what students are expected to be able to do as students and adults. The administrative staff will monitor the strategy through classroom walkthroughs and analyzing data collected on the walkthroughs as well as monitoring formative assessment data leading to focused interventions.. Education research shows that classroom discussions and teacher clarity in learning goals has an effect size of .82 and .68 respectively, exceeding a whole year of growth has an effect size of .40.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The District Instructional Framework (DIF) is the evidence-based strategy provided to us that has a clear focus on basic instructional practices that work and achieve learning gains. The DIF focuses on student learning rather than student tasks, activities, or assignments, and calls for teaching to purposely be interesting and relevant. Students learn how to find and cite evidence for what they are learning, why they are learning, and how they know they have learned it.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common planning has been provided for all ELA teachers to collaborate and provide teacher to teacher support implementing the DIF.
2. Student achievement teams identify and problem solves for students who are not making progress.
3. Students will be provided intervention time in 3 blocks for 15-20 minutes 2X a week and 1 period for 15-20 minutes 1X per week. As the year progresses, intervention time will move to a dedicated 30-40 minute period four times per week.
4. Identify students in the lower quartile for targeted interventions and equity in the classroom.
5. Behavior issues will be assigned to Positive Alternative to School Suspension (PASS) in lieu of school suspension when appropriate to keep students in school and reduce suspensions.
6. Improve student achievement through teachers receiving extra duty pay for performing tutoring, identifying deficiency areas in relation to mastery of standards, developing targeted lesson plans, and progress monitoring of interventions.

Person Responsible	Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lake County Schools established and supports a common vision through strong instruction, grade-appropriate assignments, deep engagement, and high expectations. Each day students are to be given multiple opportunities to read, write, think, and talk through authentic math literacy. The instructional practice strategies will be modeling thinking, guided instruction, independent learning, and collaborative learning. With this framework, all students will be able to make improvements in achievement level and learning gains in math courses. The most recent school data shows that our lowest quartile level of success decreased from 41% of the students to 38% of the students.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to exceed the 48% statewide learning gains and 51% statewide achievement level for all students. Math learning gains improvement will require a minimum of 8 percentage points growth and achievement level will require a minimum of 16 percentage points growth. Our bottom quartile students will improve from 38% to greater than 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize the District Instructional Framework (for planning, instruction, and learning) where the teacher is the facilitator of providing structure and opportunities each day to practice reading and writing. The teacher will provide purpose for the lesson and model what learning looks like to make the connection with what students are expected to be able to do as students and adults. The administrative staff will monitor the strategy through classroom walkthroughs and analyzing data collected on the walkthroughs. Education research shows that classroom discussions and teacher clarity in learning goals has an effect size of .82 and .68 respectively, exceeding a whole year of growth has an effect size of .40.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The District Instructional Framework (DIF) is the evidence-based strategy provided to us that has a clear focus on basic instructional practices that work and achieve learning gains. The DIF focuses on student learning rather than student tasks, activities, or assignments, and calls for teaching to purposely be interesting and relevant so students understand what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how they will know when they learned it.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common planning has been provided for all math teachers to collaborate and provide teacher to teacher support implementing the DIF.
2. Student achievement teams identify and problem solves for students who are not making progress.
3. Students will be provided intervention time in 3 blocks for 15-20 minutes 2X a week and 1 period for 15-20 minutes 1X per week. As the year progresses, intervention time will move to a dedicated 30-40 minute period four times per week.
4. Identify students in the lower quartile for targeted interventions and equity in the classroom.
5. Behavior issues will be assigned to Positive Alternative to School Suspension (PASS) in lieu of school suspension when appropriate to keep students in school and reduce suspensions.
6. Improve student achievement through teachers receiving extra duty pay for performing tutoring, identifying deficiency areas in relation to mastery of standards, developing targeted lesson plans, and progress monitoring of interventions.

Person Responsible	Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD subgroup performed below the Federal index of 41%. When the success rate falls below the 41% index, the school must take additional steps to provide high-quality instruction in the general education environment accompanied by the student's individual accommodations.
Measurable Outcome:	EHS will improve the current SWD achievement level of 38% to 42% or better, increasing achievement by 4 percentage points or more.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide high-quality instruction in the general education environment and with specialized individual accommodations during intervention time at a minimum of 2 days per week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing lesson purpose with targeted instruction that addresses student's independent needs, makes learning meaningful, relevant, and interesting. SWD will provide more effort for longer periods when they are purposely provided with what they are learning, why they are learning it, and what learning success looks like. They will spend more time practicing and applying new skills and knowledge in new ways more independently.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Adjust student bell schedule to allow for student intervention time.
2. Teachers will identify students that are considered part of the SWD subgroup and personally monitor their progress and ensure they are receiving high-quality instruction with the support of a dedicated Resource Teacher.
3. ESE Specialist will monitor SWD students to ensure students are receiving their interventions.
4. Academic achievement teams meet monthly and will discuss the progress of SWD students to make sure student's needs are identified, receiving their accommodations, and are receiving high-quality instruction.
5. Attendance Team will identify and provide strategies to students in need of attendance support.
6. Students are provided with additional classroom support within identified ELA and Math classrooms through Support Facilitators.
7. Students will be assigned to PASS restorative practice in lieu of OSS when appropriate.
8. Formative assessments will be used to monitor student progress and identify areas for interventions.

Person Responsible	Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Black/African American (B/AA) subgroup performed below the Federal index of 41%. When the success rate falls below the 41% index, the school must take additional steps to provide high-quality instruction suitable for B/AA students.
Measurable Outcome:	EHS will improve the current B/AA achievement level of 38% to 42% or better, increasing achievement by 4 percentage points or more.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide students with the purpose of high-quality instruction in the general education environment with specialized individual accommodations during intervention time at a minimum of 2 days per week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing purpose focuses on student learning rather than a task, making student learning meaningful, relevant, and interesting. B/AA students will engage for longer periods when they are purposely provided with what they are learning, why they are learning it, and what learning success looks like. They will spend more time practicing and applying new skills and knowledge in new ways more independently.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Adjust student bell schedule to allow for student intervention time.
2. Teachers will identify students that are considered part of the B/AA subgroup and personally monitor their progress and ensure they are receiving high-quality instruction with additional support as needed.
3. Academic achievement teams meet monthly and will discuss the progress of B/AA students to make sure student's needs are identified, receiving interventions, and are receiving high-quality instruction.
4. Students will be assigned to PASS restorative practice in lieu of OSS when appropriate.
5. Formative assessments will be used to monitor student progress and identify areas for interventions.

Person Responsible Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELL subgroup performed below the Federal index of 41%. When the success rate falls below the 41% index, the school must take additional steps to provide high-quality instruction appropriate for struggling ELL students.
Measurable Outcome:	To help all ELL students make academic progress and achieve learning gains exceeding the 41% Federal Index. EHS will improve the current 29% by 13 percentage points or greater.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide high-quality instruction in the general education environment and with specialized individual accommodations appropriate for ELL students during intervention time at a minimum of 2 days per week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing purpose focuses on student learning rather than a task, making student learning meaningful, relevant, and interesting. ELL students will provide more effort for longer periods when they are purposely provided with what they are learning, why they are learning it, and what learning success looks like. They will spend more time practicing and applying new skills and knowledge in new ways more independently.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Adjust student bell schedule to allow for student intervention time.
2. Teachers will identify students that are considered part of the ELL subgroup and personally monitor their progress and ensure they are receiving high-quality instruction with additional ELL specific support as needed.
3. Academic achievement teams meet monthly and will discuss the progress of ELL students to make sure student's needs are identified, receiving interventions, and are receiving high-quality instruction.
4. Students will be assigned to PASS restorative practice in lieu of OSS when appropriate.
5. Formative assessments will be used to monitor student progress and identify areas for interventions appropriate for ELL students.

Person Responsible Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	EHS leadership is committed to building a culture where all teachers believe in our Collective Commitments and Core Values that are built upon research-based teaching strategies and interventions for students.
Measurable Outcome:	EHS will meet or exceed the state average for student achievement in math and ELA, including exceeding the Federal achievement index of 41% for SWD, B/AA, and ELL students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Clark (clarkt1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	EHS' Collective Commitments are founded on Standards-Based Instruction with reading, writing, thinking, and talking in every classroom, each period of the day. We utilize the Instructional Framework for planning & implementation of instruction: Purpose, Modeling Thinking, Guided Instruction, Independent Learning, and Collaborative Learning. We have common planning for all teachers to effectively plan their lessons and include common formative assessments. Common planning is also used for comparing & analyzing formative assessment data to drive further instruction. We are committed to engage students in systematic interventions targeting their specific needs which are determined by teacher observation and formative assessment data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	EHS believes all students can learn and achieve when standards are set high and are equitably provided to all students. EHS will utilize Student Achievement Teams to collaborate and identify those students falling behind and choose interventions most appropriate for their individual needs. EHS built time into the student's daily schedule for interventions and additional help from their teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The school Leadership Team will consistently promote EHS Collective Commitments & Core Values in all staff meetings and professional development.
2. PD will be provided on creating effective formative assessments, administering formative assessments, and what to do with formative assessment data.
3. The Teacher Induction Team will provide dedicated time for PD, collaboration, and mentoring of the new teachers.
4. EHS Administrators will attend school district hiring events to recruit qualified teachers.
5. Teacher classroom observations/walkthroughs will focus on observing Collective Commitments and feedback to teachers to help identify areas for improvement.
6. Provide teachers with common planning to collaborate on Standards-Based Instruction and Collective Commitments.
7. Attendance Teams will identify attendance problems and work towards getting students to school consistently.
8. Student Achievement Teams will collaborate on interventions for students falling behind.
9. The Graduation Team will collaborate on interventions for seniors in danger of not graduating.
10. Positive Alternative to School Suspension and Restorative Practices will be used in lieu of suspensions when appropriate.

Person Responsible	Tracy Clark (clarkt1@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.

All areas of concern in 2.E. are addressed in 3.A. above.

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.

EHS is focused on the consistency of our Core Values & Collective Commitments and establishing the purpose for learning, student engagement, promoting a culture of reading, instructional decisions, and interventions based on formative assessments, collaborative support teams to address new teachers, struggling students, attendance issues, and graduates.

EHS will start the year teaching students about our norms in reference to academic expectations, classroom procedures and behavior, and managing distractions. Administrators will collaborate on consistent discipline that provides for equality and equity for the student. Teachers and school personnel are expected to model the behavior they want to see from their students.

Professional Development will be provided to teachers to reinforce Core Values & Collective Commitments. New teachers will be provided with a mentor to help them learn about quality teaching practices and the school's culture. Restorative Practices will be used with students to reduce suspension as they get caught up in unacceptable behavior.

The school will be a safe environment and maintained in an aesthetically pleasing way. Cleanliness is a priority and necessary to keep students healthy and safe from diseases and sickness. Appropriate staff will be trained and available to provide a physically safe environment from outside disruptions.

EHS leadership will make adjustments as necessary to provide a culturally positive environment for students and staff.

Through our actions associated with Eustis High School's Collective Commitments and Core Values, we truly represent "The Best in Everyone" and together we will celebrate countless successes.

We utilize our EHS Website and EHS Facebook to inform and promote all that is EHS. We have solid SAC involvement that continues to grow stronger in our collective commitments toward greater achievements

and successes. Our relationship with the City of Eustis is also strong and provides us great support and connection with local businesses and other resources.

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: ELA				$15,279.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0081 - Eustis High School	Other		$8,279.00
		Notes: Object is 1930 Extra Duty Pay - Instructional. Improve Student Achievement as it relates to the Lowest 25% in ELA & Math. Funding is from the school's SAI budget.				
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0081 - Eustis High School	Other		$4,000.00
		Notes: Object is 1930 Extra Duty Pay - Instructional. Improve Student Achievement in Summer Tutoring as it relates to the Lowest 25% in ELA & Math. Funding is from the school's SAI budget.				
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0081 - Eustis High School	Other		$3,000.00
		Notes: Object is 1930 Extra Duty Pay - Instructional. Improve Student Achievement with a writing team and lesson planning as it relates to the Lowest 25% in ELA & Math. Funding is from the school's SAI budget.				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				$0.00
					Total:	$15,279.00