Eustis Heights Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eustis Heights Elementary School

310 W TAYLOR AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

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

Demographics

Principal: Terri Soos   Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2020

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
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 (49%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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 Heights Elementary School

310 W TAYLOR AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

https://ehe.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)
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	71%

School Grades History

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

Eustis Heights Elementary will create and support a safe, caring learning environment in which all children and adults feel welcomed, respected, and an important part of the school community. We believe each child deserves to be successful. Our family centered environment strives to develop confidence in students as we learn together, support one another, value differences in one another, and become responsible citizens. Pride of Eustis-Success at the heart!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Recognizing that all children are unique, the mission of Eustis Heights Elementary School is to ensure that all students feel loved, respected, and encouraged while being inspired, educated, and prepared to achieve their fullest potential as lifelong learners and productive citizens in our global society.

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
Scott, Tiffany	Principal	The school leadership team consists of the Principal, two Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselor, Literacy Coach, Math/Science Coach, MTSS Coach, ESE Specialist, Instructional Dean, PASS Teacher, Mental Health Liaison, Instructional Technology, and Potential Specialist The function and responsibility of each school leadership team member is to create a system of supports for both the classroom teacher and individual students according to the intervention design outlined in the MTSS process. More specifically, the role of administration is to: 1. Oversee, evaluate, and provide assistance as instructional leaders for all instructional and non-instructional staff. 2. Oversee the MTSS process, implementation, and procedures. 3. Provide strategies, interventions, resources for teachers to implement for students, and to monitor the progress of each student. 4. Secure necessary resources to ensure to ensure all teachers are successful, which in turn will lead to student success. 5. Oversee and provide support to manage IEP's, ensure compliance, conduct IEP meetings, problem solve, and support ESE teachers and students. The leadership team meets weekly to discuss/report the following: 1. Core instruction alignment among grade levels (instructional planning and delivery is standards-based, data-driven, and differentiated instruction) **Person(s) responsible: Literacy coach, Math/Science Coach, and Administration 2. Small group instruction is skill specific for student needs based upon data. **Person(s) responsible: Potential Specialist, Literacy Coach, Math/Science Coach, and Administration 3. School-wide data driven professional learning communities. (SIPPS, iReady, ALEKS, Performance Matters Assessments, Teacher Made Assessments and Student Grades.) **Person(s) responsible: Potential Specialist, Literacy Coach, Math/Science Coach, & Administration 4. Early Warning Systems (Attendance, Discipline, and PBS) **Person(s) responsible: Administration, Potential Specialist, and Guidance 5. Lowest Quartile Data Tracking and Retained Students **Person(s) responsible: Potential Specialist, MTSS Coach, Administration and Guidance 6. MTSS Status **Person(s) Responsible: MTSS Coach and Administration 7. ESE/ELL Status **Person(s) responsible: ESE Specialist & MTSS Coach 8. Professional Learning Communities **Person(s) responsible: Administration, Literacy Coach, and Math/Science Coach 9. Professional Development Needs **Person(s) responsible: Administration, Literacy Coach, and Math/Science Coach 10. Support/Celebrations **Person(s) responsible: All Members

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bellefleur, Eileen	Teacher, ESE	ESE School Specialist
Martin Eubanks, Linda	Other	Potential Specialist who oversees interventions.
Wolfe, Kacy	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Ward, Ashley	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor
Peterkin, Andrie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Douglas, Elizabeth	Dean	Instructional Dean
Bob, Linda	Teacher, K-12	PASS Teacher
Martinez, Janet	Other	Mental Health Liaison
Soos, Terri	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Morris, Jennifer A	Instructional Coach	
Flint, Mikel A.	Instructional Coach	
Taylor, Aja A.	Instructional Technology	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/31/2020, Terri Soos

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.*
15

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.*
28

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)	Elementary School PK-5
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 (49%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	65	79	69	96	79	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	21	11	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	1	6	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	4	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	4	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	30	49	44	54	53	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	111	108	126	112	125	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	710
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	22	16	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	15	6	11	13	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
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	45	46	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	36	23	34	40	45	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239

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	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	7	12	21	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	111	108	126	112	125	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	710
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	22	16	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	15	6	11	13	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
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	45	46	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	36	23	34	40	45	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239

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	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	7	12	21	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	48%	58%	57%	42%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	57%	58%	49%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	49%	53%	52%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	60%	63%	47%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	56%	62%	50%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	39%	51%	30%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	54%	53%	29%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(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**	
03	2019	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%	
	2018	40%	61%	-21%	57%	-17%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	46%	60%	-14%	58%	-12%	
	2018	43%	59%	-16%	56%	-13%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison		6%					
05	2019	51%	59%	-8%	56%	-5%	
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	55%	-20%	
Same Grade Comparison		16%					
Cohort Comparison		8%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%	
	2018	40%	65%	-25%	62%	-22%	
Same Grade Comparison		24%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	51%	61%	-10%	64%	-13%	
	2018	47%	60%	-13%	62%	-15%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		11%					
05	2019	43%	57%	-14%	60%	-17%	
	2018	39%	58%	-19%	61%	-22%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	29%	54%	-25%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
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	26	35	30	27	42	38	28				
ELL	33	39	29	46	38	31	29				
BLK	31	50	59	30	37	30	29				
HSP	47	52	35	59	52	32	38				
MUL	47	62		63	62						
WHT	61	65	77	60	57	50	74				
FRL	44	55	50	49	48	31	39				
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	17	26	17	20	30	17	10				
ELL	24	44		32	35						
BLK	28	33	19	26	32	26	22				
HSP	33	41	12	41	41	23	21				
MUL	53	58		59	58						
WHT	55	50		64	57	17	46				
FRL	36	40	19	41	41	25	27				
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	16	42	52	23	38	39					
ELL	36	57		43	33		23				
BLK	28	45	60	30	36	31	9				
HSP	46	56	64	61	61		37				
MUL	53	50		47	56						
WHT	52	47	20	50	55	27	43				
FRL	39	46	51	46	47	29	26				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	36
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	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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
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	63
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	46
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 data component that show the lowest performance was Math Lowest 25th Percentile with 34% during the 2018-19 school year and 24% during the 2017-18 school year. Although this is an increase in student performance as compared to the previous year, it is at least a 13% difference from the other school grade components. One of the contributing factors was not providing students with adequate time on remedial math skills.

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

Fortunately, there was no decline from the prior year in any category. The focus on standards based instruction, support through systematic interventions, professional learning communities and continuous monitoring and reevaluation were the contributing factors.

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.

1. The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average based on the school grade component during the 2018-19 school year was Math Lowest 25th Percentile. The school earned 34% and the state earned 51%, a 17% difference. During the 2017-18 school year, the school earned a 24% on this component while the state earned 47%, a 23% difference.

2. The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average when looking at grade level data during the 2018-19 school year was 5th grade math. The school earned 43% proficiency rate while the state earned 60%, a 17% difference. This difference was higher at 22% during the previous year (2017-18) with the school earning 39% and the state earning 61%. This does appear to be a trend.

Both of these data points appear to be a trend. The percentage of students proficient in all math categories are historically below the proficiency rate demonstrated in ELA as well as the state. The factors that contributed to this trend appears to be the inability to provide consistent Math support from an instructional coach to support core instruction and the inability to provide systematic interventions within Math.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile was the data component that showed the most improvement moving from 19% during the 2017-18 school year to 54% during the 2018-19 school year, a 35% difference. This year there were several actions that contributed to this change. During the 2018-19 we utilized the Leveled Literacy Intervention program to support our lowest quartile and dedicated time and human capital to ensure that the systems ran daily based on the allotted within the schedule. Staff administering the program were trained on how to implement the program and the program was monitored with fidelity.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), the primary area of concern is the increase in the number of students with attendance below 90%. During the 2018-19 school year there were 104 students with attendance below 90%, while there were only 65 students during the 2017-18 school year. This is an increase of 39 students

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

1. Improving the number of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains within Math.
2. Improving learning gains in Math and ELA with students who are SWD, ELL and Black.
3. Improving overall student achievement in Math, ELA, and Science.
4. Reduce the number of students with two or more EWS indicators.
5. Reduce the number of student with attendance below 90%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan, and deliver standards based instruction where students can state what they are learning, why they are learning it and how they know they have learned it. Strong collaborative planning around strong standards based instruction will ensure that grade appropriate task and quality instruction is consistently delivered. This thoughtful planning will ensure the instructional needs of our under performing subgroups (SWD, Black, ELL), and all students will be met. The data shows that we are improving from year to year but our proficiency rate is below 50% in almost all subgroups other than our white students in ELA and Math. This suggest that the core (standards based instruction) can use an improvement when less than 50% of our students are not meeting proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Reading, Writing, Thinking and Talking across all content areas and build capacity in the six Marzano elements as evidenced by quarterly increases and also doubling the percent of learning walk tool look-fors from baseline to mid-year learning walks; Recruit and retain highly effective teachers by supporting a collaborative student-centered environment that provides access and utilization of state of the art educational technology. Increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 48% to 51%, ELA Learning Gains from 57% to 60%, Math Proficiency from 53% to 56%, Math Learning Gains from 51% to 54%, and Science Proficiency from 47% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Scott (scottt1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy that will be used is engaging in professional learning communities. This strategy will be monitored through consistent participation within PLCs, PLC forms (include agenda, minutes, participants,and follow up task(s), and classroom walkthroughs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale behind this strategy is that if teachers, administrators and coaches consistently engage in PLCs that focus on purpose, developing quality tasks and coherent instructional delivery in a cycle that will allow them to plan, teach, analyze and apply their findings, we will reduce equity gaps among classes. This cycle is expected to narrow the focus around standards based instruction, and increase teacher competency. Additionally, we will be able to intentionally and consistently provide quality learning experiences for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a common understanding around professional learning communities, our focus which is purpose, and standards based instruction through professional development.

Person Responsible	Kacy Wolfe (wolfek@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Create a common planning schedule, PLC protocols, expectations, and a designated time for planning.

Person Responsible	Tiffany Scott (scottt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Develop, utilize and follow an administrative schedule for attending and supporting weekly common planning.

Person Responsible	Jennifer A Morris (morrisj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Administration and content area coaches will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor for transfer and provide feedback around our focus, purpose.

Person Responsible Tiffany Scott (scottt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

5. Consistently engage in PLCs, monitor for desired outcomes, and make adjustments where needed.

Person Responsible Kacy Wolfe (wolfek@lake.k12.fl.us)

6. PLC teams will analyze student assessments and work products to monitor learning and guide next steps.

Person Responsible Jennifer A Morris (morrisj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By utilizing student achievement data, Eustis Heights Elementary will tailor interventions and accelerations for all students in Reading, Math, and Science to increase student achievement among all student to include our student under performing in key subgroups (Black, ELL, SWD). Tailoring interventions and accelerations for all students will allow us to meet the individual needs of each students allowing us to close achievement gaps. The data reveals that while we have made progress in improving learning gains we are still below the federal index for SWD, ELL, and Black. Providing more specific accelerations and interventions will allow us to improve student outcomes and more accurately meet their learning needs.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome that EHES plans to achieve is an increase in student achievement in ELA Achievement from 48% to 51%, ELA Learning Gains from 57% to 60%, ELA Lowest Quartile from 54% to 57%, Math Achievement from 53% to 56%, Math Learning Gains from 51% to 54%, Math Lowest Quartile from 34% to 50%, and Science Achievement from 47% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Scott (scottt1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy is providing students with systematic interventions that will remediate or accelerate student learning based on their individual needs using small group instruction, Fountas & Pinnell- Leveled Literacy Intervention, Rosetta Stone, SIPPS, iReady Reading & Math, and ALEKS.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale behind this strategy is that if students are provided the time within a school day to receive systematic support (interventions/accelerations) in addition to core instruction, students will be able to recover learning gaps while building current grade level knowledge and skills. This strategy will allow all students including the lowest quartile,and students in critical need subgroups (SWD, ELL, Black) to get their individual learning needs met, resulting in higher student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create established time for targeted small group instruction, and schedules for implementation.

Person Responsible	Linda Martin Eubanks (eubanksl@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Create and train an intervention team to assist with small group instruction for interventions (SIPPs, iReady, Rosetta Stone, ALEKS, LLI, and Standards Based Stations).

Person Responsible	Linda Martin Eubanks (eubanksl@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Conduct weekly walk-through to monitor for implementation and fidelity of interventions during small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Mikel A. Flint (flintm@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Progress monitor student data using iReady (ELA & Math), LLI assessments (ELA), ALEKS (Math), SIPPS tracking (Reading Readiness), Rosetta Stone, Performance Matters (ELA, Math, and Science), and Teacher Made Assessments (ELA & Math) with an intentional focus on the lowest quartile and student subgroups (SWD, ELL and Black) monthly so that we can continuously make adjustments.

Person Responsible	Terri Soos (soost@lake.k12.fl.us)

5. Build instructional capacity among our leadership team around differentiation and closing the achievement gap by engaging in a book study from Dr. Anthony Muhammed entitled "Overcoming the Achievement Gap Trap" in an effort to support teachers in using best practices when providing interventions and accelerations for all students.

Person Responsible   Tiffany Scott (scottt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By utilizing early warning systems data, Eustis Heights Elementary will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students. These elements have a direct correlation to student achievement. Therefore by improving these elements we are creating a stronger foundation for learning and cultivating an environment for which students can thrive.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to reduce the number of students meeting the EWS for absences and maintain 7% or less each quarter. Additionally, we will Increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 48% to 51%, ELA Learning Gains from 57% to 60%, Math Proficiency from 53% to 56%, Math Learning Gains from 51% to 54%, ELA Lowest Quartile Learning gains from 54% to 57%; Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 34% to 50%, and Science proficiency from 47% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Scott (scottt1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy that we will be used is the implementation of a school wide positive behavior plan that will offer incentives for students demonstrating desired positive behaviors and monitors early warning sign data to intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors. We will also increase home to school communication by providing more opportunities for families to be involved.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support practices that will foster a positive and supportive learning environment than attendance will increase. Additionally, building relationships with families increase communication and support from home to support students academically.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement a school-wide positive behavior plan.

Person Responsible	Andrie Peterkin (peterkina@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. The positive behavior support team will monitor EWS data and provide supports to students when and where needed.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Douglas (douglase@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Provide faculty and staff with professional development on Restorative Practices so that it may be used school wide.

Person Responsible	Andrie Peterkin (peterkina@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Utilize services and staff such as our Mental Health Liaison, Positive Alternative School Suspension Teacher, and Guidance Counselor to support our neediest students.

Person Responsible	Andrie Peterkin (peterkina@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.

The Areas of Focus mentioned above address the schoolwide improvement priorities identified earlier in 2.E. of the Needs Assessment/Analysis. However, the critical role of the school leadership team is to implement these measures with fidelity and to continuously monitor for progress. When we are making progress, we will ensure things are running as intended. However, when they are not, we will review the data and take into account observations to adjust or change the plan. The effectiveness of this plan relies on the timeliness of feedback. Therefore, the leadership team will meet a minimum of twice a month to review the practices outlined here-in. We will draw on the collective and individual strengths of the team to make these decisions.

Additionally, The school has a MTSS team in place to address the academic and behavioral needs of students. The procedures include teachers discussing students who are showing a deficiency when compared to the grade level standards/benchmarks. The team will discuss strategies and interventions that address the specific areas of concern. Once strategies or interventions are put into place, ongoing data analysis occurs with the team to make data-driven decisions in the best interest of the student. Support and resources will be provided for students to be successful. A triangulation of data/resources are used: Grade K-FLKRS; teacher observation of skills; Mid-Year SIPPS Assessments. Grades 1-5: iReady ELA/Math; SIPPS; ALEKS; Performance Matters Assessments; ELA/Math grades; and FSA assessment scores.

All funding for school-based programs is utilized for the enhancement of student learning opportunities and for student growth.

Supplemental Academic Instruction funding is used to provide supplemental resources and collaborative planning time, ALEKS math program will be used for interventions with the lowest 25%.

Title 1, Part A: Funds provide academic support to students to assist them in achieving the standards in the local curriculum and the Florida Standards. Opportunities will include before and after school programs and resource assistance during the school day. Title I funds provides personnel and resources for students and parents. Designated staff facilitates materials check-out, parent workshops and communication between teachers and parents.

IDEA funds: Funds provide academic support to assist students in achieving the standards in the local curriculum and the Florida standards. Funds are utilized to purchase supplemental support materials and technology.

Homeless, Migrant, ELLs are given additional family support, tutoring, and resources with Federal Programs.

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.

Parent and community involvement is vital to Eustis Heights Elementary School. We believe that parent, families and community stakeholders comprise of our most important stakeholders. Our stakeholders will help support the school mission and vision as well as contribute to school improvement for the betterment of our student needs in the following ways:

1. Quarterly parent/grandparent support classes.
2. Community and Family Input with the Title I Plan, Parent Involvement Plan, and School Compact.
3. Parent Teacher Conference Nights twice a year.
4. Title 1 Survey and follow up meetings.
5. Increase virtual communication using all social media outlets to provide for two-way communication.
6. Continue partnerships with local organizations to ensure our neediest families receive, books, school supplies, clothes, food, and other resources.
7. Actively recruit, retain, and meet with our PTO and SAC while addressing current issues through all stakeholder input.
8. Host virtual events where face-to-face communications are not present.
9. Send home monthly news letters in English and Spanish.
10. Work with our feeder pattern middle school to arrange for visitations/orientation days for our outgoing 5th grade students to include ESE students.
11. Partner with child care centers and invite them to visit classes and our school in preparation for PreK and Kindergarten transitions and share PreK and KG readiness goals.
12. Conduct virtual meet the teachers, curriculum nights, and Annual Title I Meetings.

Once face-to-face communications are safe to resume, we will also:
13. Host special events to build community and celebrate student success(Movie Night, Honor Roll Ceremonies, Intervention Ceremonies, Terrific Kid, etc.).
14. Conduct home visits as needed.
15. Host monthly family dinner night where educational resources are provided in addition to a free meal.
16. Open the Parent Resource Center where parents can check out a variety of resources to support student learning and encourage literacy in the home.
17. Provide community mentors for at-risk youth or students with more than 2 Early Warning Signs.
18. Utilize volunteers at school events (Class Readers,Tiger Loot Day, Career Day, Field Day, etc.).
19. Allow community partners provide free services and information to families.
20. Actively recruit and retain volunteers and mentors for students.
21. Host a volunteer and community breakfast to provide information and thank them for their support.
22. Continue the Laundry Program to allow our neediest students an opportunity to wash and wear clean clothing.
23. Offer "Kindergarten Round Up" in the spring to orient and provide parents and students with information

regarding curriculum, services, schedules, and special events for incoming Kindergarten students.
24. Conduct team builders and morale boosters for faculty and staff monthly.

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00