

Lake County Schools

# Eustis Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Eustis Elementary School

714 E CITRUS AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Reanna Boardway**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Eustis Elementary School

714 E CITRUS AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	94%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

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

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

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

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

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

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2018, Reanna Broadway

**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.*

0



**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

36

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	28	50	49	64	64	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	5	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	2	3	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	3	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	27	33	28	38	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154

**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	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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**

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	18	16	32	24	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	18	16	32	24	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	58%	57%	54%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	57%	58%	55%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	49%	53%	50%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	59%	60%	63%	67%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	46%	56%	62%	52%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	39%	51%	50%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	54%	53%	47%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	53%	59%	-6%	56%	-3%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison				-14%		
Cohort Comparison				-20%		

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	56%	-15%	53%	-12%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison				-16%		
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	44	36	24	25	13	9				
ELL	48	50		48	46	30	29				
BLK	39	41	15	46	41	17	20				
HSP	54	58	31	47	39	29	35				
MUL	69			77							
WHT	69	61	75	72	51	40	56				
FRL	46	51	38	53	44	20	38				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	35	52	70	45	35						
ELL	33	67		50	47						
BLK	51	61	65	46	43	26	27				
HSP	50	60		60	43		56				
WHT	72	52	50	80	55	38	68				
FRL	59	61	57	63	46	29	53				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	28	46	41	39	30	23	25				
ELL	41	25		70	67						
BLK	34	50	50	40	29	43	32				
HSP	50	44		69	48		23				
WHT	63	59	48	79	59	53	59				
FRL	44	46	48	59	49	53	34				

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	61
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	42
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.**

ON the 2019 FSA, Our Math lowest twenty fifth percentile showed the lowest performance with 26% proficient, up 16% from the previous year. We implemented strategic interventions, but focused heavily on ELA as our ELA lowest quartile had decreased 17 points from the previous year.

On the midyear iReady diagnostic, our lowest ELA performance was first grade reading at 31% on or above grade level. Our lowest Math performance was also 1st grade with 24% of students on or above grade level in first grade. Contributing factors included lack of fidelity with intervention program implementation and a common planning structure/agenda that focused on housekeeping/logistical items and was transitioning to one that allowed for teacher collaboration around the PLC questions

(What do we want students to know and be able to do? How will we respond when they don't learn? How will we respond when they already know it?).

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

The state assessment data component that showed the greatest decline was the Science Achievement, which dropped 19 points from 59% to 40%. Possible contributing factors include lack of common planning focused on Science instruction, teachers using different texts to guide instruction, minimal hands-on experiments, lack of data discussions, and a priority on ELA and Math instruction.

On our midyear iReady diagnostic, the greatest decline was 3rd grade ELA in which 18% fewer students were on grade level compared to the previous year. One contributing factor was the need to raise teacher expectations and build collective efficacy.

**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.**

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average is FSA Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Our proficiency was 26% and the state's was 51%. Potential factors include inconsistency among teachers regarding which materials to use, hesitancy to common plan together, and an intervention system that consisted of teachers differentiating within their classrooms rather than collaborating to target individual students' needs. There was a primary focus on ELA instruction during intervention time.

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

From 18-19 to 19-20, the iReady midyear diagnostic showed that 5th grade ELA had the most improvement, increasing the number of students on or above grade level at midyear from 28% to 49%. The team was restructured, teammates had high expectations for all students, intervention groups were targeted and fluid, and teachers met weekly to plan together, focusing on the PLC questions to guide their work.

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

1. Absences
2. Course Failures

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

1. Equity for all students
2. Active participation in a PLC to establish clear a purpose for student learning (What are we learning? Why are we learning it? How will we know when we have learned it?)
3. High expectations for all students using CHAMPS as a guideline
4. Create and protect an intervention time of at least 30-45 minutes four days a week in which instruction is targeted to individual needs and student groups are fluid
5. Student attendance > 90%

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We will focus on the District Instructional Framework, specifically setting the purpose. When planning for instruction, teachers will make sure the purpose of the lesson is aligned to the standards, focuses on student learning rather than a task, and is interesting and relevant. Students will be able to state what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how they will know they have learned it. If students are receiving instruction that is not aligned with the standards, then they will not be proficient on standards-based assessments nor be engaged in learning that addresses the level of rigor appropriate for the students' grade level. If students cannot state what they are learning as it relates to the standard, then they have no way to gauge their own progress through the use of success criteria. If students do not understand why they are learning the content, then they will not associate importance or relevance with the work, therefore becoming less engaged. If students do not know the success criteria, they will not be motivated to rise to high expectations. Our lowest 25th percentile data indicates that students do not have mastery of the standards. Our subgroup data shows that black students scored below the overall federal index, earning 31% of the available points possible. This indicates that the learning is not relevant and interesting to them.

**Measurable Outcome:**

On the 2020 FSA, we will increase our ELA and Math lowest 25th percentile gains to 62%. Science achievement on the state assessment will rise to 62%.  
On the midyear iReady diagnostic, we expect 50% of students to be on or above grade level in all grade levels.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Meet weekly in PLC to plan instruction that focuses on four questions:  
1. What do we want students to know and be able to do? (What are we learning?)  
2. How we will we know if they are learning? (Success Criteria)  
3. How will we respond when they don't learn? (Interventions)  
4. How will we respond when they already know it? (Enrichment)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

According to John Hattie's Visible Learning research, teacher clarity yields a 0.75 effect size if done consistently and correctly. Therefore, students will be able to state what they are learning and why they are learning it using student-friendly, academic language. Success criteria yields a 0.57 effect size so students will be able to explain how they will know they have learned it.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Create and protect a weekly PLC time (Wednesdays 2:30-3:30)
2. Include intervention on the master schedule for 30-45 minutes 4 days a week for grades K-5.
3. Make sure students have access to high quality intervention materials, including Collaborative Classroom materials (SIPPS), student response boards to use as a tool for ongoing ELA and Math intervention formative assessments, and Curriculum Associates Materials (iReady, Ready MAFS/LAFS, CAMS/STAMS, etc.).
- 3.Ensure classrooms have the technology needed to support students' instruction and display the purpose-related questions -What are we learning? Why are we learning it? How will we know we have learned it? (working document cameras, power strips to support charging Chromebooks, etc.).
4. Meet quarterly with grade levels in data meetings to monitor the progress of all students.

**Person Responsible**

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

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will use CHAMPS, a school wide positive behavior support system to improve classroom behavior, including increased time on-task, work completion, and cooperation. Teachers will establish high, clear classroom behavior expectations with logical and fair responses to misbehavior and motivate students to put forth their best efforts. Doing so will increase academic engagement as adults will spend less time disciplining students and more time teaching them. CHAMPS supports the development of a common language about behaviors through its use of the Guidelines for Success, strengthening the staff's collective efficacy. The clear discipline flowchart, incident reports aligned to the Guidelines for Success, and strategies for supporting student behavior ensures that new teachers have support with behavior management and will be more likely to stay at the school. CHAMPS will be utilized both during the school day and during after-school clubs, such as Robotics Club, Art Club, Scrabble Club, and our three music-related clubs.

**Measurable Outcome:** We plan to improve attendance so that the rate of attendance is 90% or above for all students.  
We plan to reduce the number of behavior incidents, as evidenced by a decreased number of referrals when compared to prior years.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will consistently implement CHAMPS, including the use of school-wide attention signals, common voice levels, clear expectations in the classrooms and common areas, Guidelines for Success, and the discipline flowchart both during the day and during our after-school clubs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If we use CHAMPS to promote positive behavior, students will spend less time being disciplined or engaged in misbehavior and more time actively learning. If we offer opportunities for students to participate in extracurricular clubs where CHAMPS is used as a guideline, students and staff members will feel more connected to the school. Research finds a positive correlation between participation in extracurriculars and reading and math achievement, course grades, sense of belonging and academic self-concept.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Staff members will teach students the Guidelines for Success, state them daily, and refer to them when addressing student behavior. Guidelines for Success will be posted in classrooms and common areas.
2. Posters of the CHAMPS expectations will be placed in common areas.
3. The attendance team will meet monthly to address student absences and develop systems of support and incentives.
4. Student achievement, both academic and behavioral, will be celebrated quarterly through awards and socials, including honor roll socials.
5. Provide opportunities for students to participate in extracurricular activities, including Art Club, Scrabble Club, Robotics Club, and a variety of music-based clubs.

**Person Responsible:** Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Teachers will form fluid, differentiated intervention groups to support learners at every level based on formative assessments. If we form fluid, differentiated intervention groups to support learners at every level, then students will receive targeted instruction and the lowest quartile ELA will increase from 39% to 62%. Lowest quartile math achievement will increase from 26% to 62%. When planning for interventions, teachers will collaborate with one another, including ESE teachers, to ensure that students with disabilities are receiving equitable learning opportunities and tasks. Interventions for students with learning disabilities can yield a 0.77 effect size if done consistently and correctly. Teachers will also discuss how black students will be exposed to and engaged in rigorous learning experiences and how the content will be relevant and engaging to them.

**Measurable Outcome:** The lowest quartile ELA achievement will increase from 39% to 62%. Lowest quartile math achievement will increase from 26% to 62%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** During weekly PLCs, we will use data from the Benchmark Assessment System, iReady, SIPPS Placement and Mastery Tests, and formative assessments to form fluid intervention groups based on students' current needs. Groups will be formed using iReady Instructional Grouping Profiles as a starting guide. Explicit and strategic small group instruction will be planned using the four PLC questions and implemented during scheduled intervention time.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** According to John Hattie's "Visible Learning" research, if teachers collaborate with peers to improve practice, then learning will increase (Collective Teacher Efficacy- +1.57 effect size). Early interventions can yield an effect size of 0.44 and response to intervention can yield a 1.29 effect size!

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Use assessment data, including iReady, SIPPS mastery tests, and Benchmark Assessment System, to form intervention groups that will be fluid based on ongoing assessment results and data.
2. Create and establish an intervention schedule with identified interventions by assigned interventionists. Strategically schedule instructional and support staff to support students during intervention time.
3. Meet weekly in PLC to monitor student progress and discuss intervention and enrichment responses for students with special attention to bottom quartile students, students with disabilities, and black students.

**Person Responsible:** Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@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.

**Our three areas of focus explicitly address purpose, high expectations through CHAMPS guidelines, and consistent, targeted interventions for students. Attendance was addressed within the Culture & Environment focus area. Our school leadership team will address equity by forming an equity team that will meet regularly to plan equitable learning opportunities and experiences for all students., The team will also plan and deliver professional development to staff to address equity and data and engage in quarterly data meetings that address subgroup data. During weekly PLC conversations, leadership team facilitators will engage teacher collaborators in planning equitable opportunities for all students with a focus on our previously underrepresented achievement groups (black students and students with disabilities).**

## 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.

Each month, the school holds at least one family engagement event, including Meet the Teacher in August, our annual Title 1 curriculum night and Donuts with Dear Ones in September, a Family Picnic in October and February, Report Card Conferences in October, a STEAM Night in November, a Reading Night in December, a Science Fair Night in January, a March Madness Testing Information Night, a Night of the Arts in April, and a Muffin But Love event for mothers and positive role models in May.

Once a month, our School Advisory Council (SAC) meets to allow all stakeholders input in making school improvement decisions. Our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meets directly afterwards each month with the purpose of working together to promote positive relationships among all stakeholders, especially parents and teachers.

Eustis Elementary has many business partners that support our staff members and students through incentives, recognition, and school improvement projects. Our business partners include Leesburg Home Depot, St. Thomas Episcopal Church, Lake Eustis Christian Church, Lifepointe Church, Sonic in Eustis, Dunkin' Donuts in Eustis, Mount Dora Lowes, and First Presbyterian Church of Eustis.

Information is given to all stakeholders via social media, including Facebook and Twitter. Our school is one of a few schools piloting the use of Instagram to connect with our community. Our school website is updated regularly and stakeholders also receive flyers and call-outs, inviting them to participate in SAC and PTO.

**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.**

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>				<b>\$1,701.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Eustis Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,701.00
			<i>Notes: SIPPS Materials will be used to support our level 1 and 2 students during a scheduled intervention time four days a week.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Early Warning Systems</b>				<b>\$1,299.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Eustis Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,299.00
			<i>Notes: Poster maker materials will be used to create and display our CHAMPS Guidelines for Success in common areas. Posters of CHAMPS expectations will also be placed in common areas. High expectations for achievement and behavior will support our Level 1 and 2 students by limiting disruptions to learning.</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$3,000.00</b>