

Lake County Schools

# Eustis Elementary School



## 2021-22 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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>26</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: 8/10/2021

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

## 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](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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>26</b> |

## Eustis Elementary School

714 E CITRUS AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 63%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | C       | C       | B       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

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

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

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

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name             | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------|----------------|---|
| Boardway, Reanna | Principal      | The purpose of the job is to administer the coordination and management of all elementary school campus and academic activities. Employees in this job classification are responsible for developing, administering, and monitoring educational programs, optimizing academic opportunities, and promoting safe and successful development of each student. Position is accountable for enforcing and ensuring academic integrity, compliance with the faculty contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic objectives through instructional programs, and accomplishes such in coordination with Schools Board goals and initiatives. Performs related work as directed. |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/10/2021, Reanna Boardway

**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.*

4

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

41

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

341

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2021-22

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                              | 34          | 40 | 63 | 68 | 60 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 327   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 1           | 13 | 19 | 19 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 24 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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           | 2 | 10 | 15 | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| 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

Tuesday 8/10/2021

### 2020-21 - 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               | 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  |       |

**2020-21 - 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               | 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  |       |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

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      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 57%    | 58%      | 57%   | 63%    | 59%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 56%    | 57%      | 58%   | 56%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 39%    | 49%      | 53%   | 56%    | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 59%    | 60%      | 63%   | 68%    | 63%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 46%    | 56%      | 62%   | 49%    | 54%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 26%    | 39%      | 51%   | 29%    | 41%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 40%    | 54%      | 53%   | 59%    | 55%      | 55%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 62%    | 60%      | 2%                         | 58%   | 4%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 60%      | -1%                        | 58%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -62%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 53%    | 59%      | -6%                        | 56%   | -3%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -59%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 73%    | 62%      | 11%                        | 62%   | 11%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 62%    | 61%      | 1%                         | 64%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -73%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 43%    | 57%      | -14%                       | 60%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -62%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 56%      | -15%                       | 53%   | -12%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool used by EES for the data below is based on iReady diagnostic results for the 2020-2021 school year.

| Grade 1               |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 11.31 | 23.53  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |       |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 1.89  | 12.24  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |       |        |        |

| Grade 2               |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 22.81 | 37.74  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 12.28 | 20.75  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
| Grade 3               |                            |       |        |        |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 36    | 67.27  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 12    | 31.48  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |

| Grade 4               |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 26.78 | 34.61  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 16.07 | 33.34  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
| Grade 5               |                            |       |        |        |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 25    | 37.29  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 19.67 | 44.61  |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |
| Science               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 52    | 77     |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       |        |        |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| <b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b> |
| SWD  | 23              | 50            |                    | 30               |                |                     | 20              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 30              |               |                    | 35               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 33              | 24            |                    | 32               | 24             |                     | 29              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 43              | 54            |                    | 50               | 58             |                     | 43              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 40              |               |                    | 20               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 61              | 35            |                    | 73               | 32             |                     | 74              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 45              | 41            | 50                 | 41               | 33             | 33                  | 39              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| 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              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| 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              |                |                  |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 43  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 5   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 39  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 340 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested   | 99% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 31  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 35  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 28  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 48  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 30  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |

| 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%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 55  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 40  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Year over year we are seeing proficiency concerns in our K-2 grade levels. We know in order to reach success in 3-5 we must work on our foundational grade levels to provide them with students that are equipped to handle the content and rigor of the state tested areas. We are also noticing an academic achievement gap in both our SWD's and our Black student subgroups.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the iReady progress monitoring for Fall and Winter of the 2020-2021 school year we know that there needs to be an intense focus on our K-2 students in both reading and math. We are also intensely focused on our accelerating our already proficient students to ensure that they continue to demonstrate learning gains. Our Tiered intervention program with a walk-to Tier 3 intervention, in conjunction with Tier 1 and Tier 2 in the classroom, from content area experts will continue to build our lowest quartile.

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to this need for improvement was the end of the year iReady data for K-2, the inverted MTSS pyramid of student needs which lead us to the focus of strengthen core instruction collectively, the end of the year 20-21 FSA data, and the state reported subgroup data.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?



We had a few areas of improvement to celebrate, the most gains year over year were our 5th grade science scores which grew from 41% to 53%.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Our teachers planned collaborative and utilized, science boot camp, science slides from Kelly Dodd, and the test item specs to ensure that their instruction was strong and students were getting what they needed to be successful.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

In order to accelerate their learning in science, teachers will bring back the collaborative learning piece to science to ensure students get the opportunity to engage in scientific thinking and learning from each other.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

EES will engage in job embedded, hands on, research based professional learning centered around collaborative learning, what it is and what it is not and how to plan, implement and monitor true collaborative learning in their classrooms.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

To ensure sustainability we will conduct learning walks with fidelity, have bi weekly dug out data debriefs, establish next steps, assign content area experts to teachers in need of support and lean into the curriculum to teach it as its designed. We will collectively hold each other accountable for the collective beliefs we agreed upon in the beginning of the year.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | Our data shows the need to increase the cognitive as well as the metacognitive needs of our students. Collaborative learning is the instructional strategy we will use to achieve that skill.   |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 |   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | <p>The measurable outcomes for EES students are as follows:</p> <p>K-2 ELA &amp; Math Goals:</p> <p>60% of students on or above grade level</p> <p>ELA Goals:</p> <p>3rd: from 48% to 62%</p> <p>4th: from 46% to 60%</p> <p>5th: from 42% to 60%</p> <p>LQ LG: from 40% to 60%</p> <p>LG: from 34% to 60%</p> <p>Math Goals:</p> <p>3rd: from 60% to 70%</p> <p>4th: from 43% to 60%</p> <p>5th: from 51% to 61%</p> <p>LQ LG: from 30% to 60%</p> <p>LG: from 36% to 60%</p> <p>Science Goals:</p> <p>From 53% to 70%</p> |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Monitoring for collaborative learning in the classroom will be done through ongoing learning walks by the administration as well as the content area coaches. The team will meet every two weeks to discuss data, trends, areas of support and next steps. A weekly learning walk schedule has been developed and a data collection tool for content area coaches has been developed that mirrors the administrative data collection google form. We will compare results to ensure fidelity in observation.                |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | The evidenced-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is Collaborative Learning: Consolidating Thinking with Peers. Collaborative learning will continue to move our students forward to being college and career ready by engaging students in the practice of soft skills.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | The majority of students spent over a year without true collaborative learning and the data shows the effect of such isolation and independent practices. Upon feedback from teachers, staff, and leadership, it was determined that collaborative learning was the deficit. Better Learning Through Structured Teaching emphasizes the effect of such development of habits of mind necessary for student success.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Relearn the importance of collaboration, revisit the differences between collaborative learning and cooperative learning.

**Person Responsible** Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Articulate the focus and the rationale to staff during preplanning.

**Person Responsible** Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Develop the learning walk schedule for monitoring collaborative learning in the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Kristy Beach (beachk1@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Learn within leadership what collaborative learning looks like in regards to the district instructional framework.

**Person Responsible** Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

5. Develop a data tool for content area coaches to monitor trends and results in order to deploy support to those in need (outside of administrations tool).

**Person Responsible** Kristy Beach (beachk1@lake.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

To create a supportive school community and a culture of high expectations, teachers, staff, and administrators will understand and respond to the social and emotional needs of students using strategies from Sanford Harmony as a Tier 1 mental health support. If we address the social and emotional needs of students, then we will provide a supportive environment for students to excel in core subjects. EES will also be utilizing the One School One Book literacy program to facilitate a culture of inclusivity. The book EES staff chose is "Dragons in a Bag" to highlight the black male subgroup that is often underrepresented in literature of the elementary age students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Increase Lower-quartile ELA (FSA) from 40% to 60%.  
 Increase Lower-quartile Math (FSA) from 30% to 60%  
 55% of students will be on or above grade level based on the iReady midyear assessment.  
 Absence rate (>10%) will decrease from 23% to 5%.

**Monitoring:**

Daily circle-up prompts, classroom observations, and restorative circles. Attendance team will meet monthly to monitor absence rates and create incentives to increase attendance.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Sanford Harmony is a researched-based program that targets social emotional learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Sanford Harmony is designed to foster knowledge, skills, and attitudes boys and girls need to help develop healthy identities, create meaningful relationships, and engage productively.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The PASS teacher will conduct classroom observations and restorative practices, as needed.

**Person Responsible**

Michelle Tatar (tatarm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Sanford Harmony's morning circle prompts at the start of each day.

**Person Responsible**

Raelynn Poole (pooler@lake.k12.fl.us)

Attendance monitored and incentives in place to decrease absences/increase attendance.

**Person Responsible**

Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us)

Recite Guidelines for Success each morning on the morning announcements.

**Person Responsible**

Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide mentors from leadership team for lower-quartile students

**Person Responsible**

Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us)

Small group guidance lessons provided by the guidance counselor.

|                           |                                       |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Tushena Scott (scottt@lake.k12.fl.us) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2 interventions will be implemented by the classroom teacher. For all Tier 3 students we will utilize a walk-to model implemented by the instructional coaches. At the mid year data point, SAI funds will be utilized to provide additional tutoring for K-2 students who are not demonstrating proficiency or growth. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | At the midyear diagnostic for iReady, we expect 55% of our students to be on or above grade level.<br>On the 2021-2022 FSA, we will increase our ELA and Math lowest quartile gains to 60%.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Learning walks will be conducted regularly and data will be collected using the District Learning Walk tool. This data will be reviewed regularly by the leadership team.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | [no one identified]   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Tier 2 Interventions will be iReady Tools for Instruction, a research-based program. Our Tier 3 Interventions will come from iReady Re-Teach, a research-based program as well.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | We selected the iReady intervention tools because they are a research based program that supports our District Instructional Framework as well as the MTSS program.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Instructional Coaches will print all iReady Tools for Instruction Lessons for teachers.

**Person Responsible** Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Classroom teachers will pull instructional groupings each week and implement the lessons provided.

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

Classroom teachers will give common assessments weekly, record data and report to our MTSS contact.

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

Instructional Coaches will set a schedule for pulling tier 3 students.

**Person Responsible** Kristy Beach (beachk1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Instructional Coaches will pull iReady Re-Teach lessons and implement them with tier 3 students.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Wiseman (wisemanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

iReady contact will assign Growth Monitoring assessments to record data. Data will be submitted to MTSS contact.

**Person Responsible** Kristy Beach (beachk1@lake.k12.fl.us)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This ELA focus area will address the needs of both students in grades 3-5 with a proficiency score of less than 50 % evidenced by the FSA for 2020-2021, as well as K-2 students that fall in the red category for proficiency according to iReady BOY data. According to the BOY iReady data, 58% of Kindergarteners placed 1 grade level below, 7.14% of 1st graders placed 2 grade levels below, and 31.25% of second graders placed 2 grade levels below. 3rd grade FSA scores for the 20-21 school year indicated 52% of students achieved a level 1 or 2, 54% of 4th graders achieved at a level 1 or 2 and 58% of 5th graders achieved a level 1 or level 2 on the FSA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

As a result of implementing the evidence-based strategies below, Eustis Elementary will raise ELA achievement by 4% for each grade level K-5.

**Monitoring:**

The ELA achievement and reading proficiency in grades K-5 will be monitored in multiple ways:

- Classroom Learning Walks
- Leadership team debrief meetings with next steps with assigned team member
- iReady BOY & MOY data.
- Quarterly data chats with teachers.
- Close monitoring of iReady minutes
- Progress monitoring of LLI

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

There are a number of strategies being used depending on the needs of the learner. LLI will be utilized for our K-2 students that are in the lower quartile in reading. We will also utilize SIPPS for those learners that are not responding to the LLI intervention and are in Tier 3 of MTSS. All teachers K-5 will be using standards aligned materials adopted by the county; Wit and Wisdom. The K-2 teachers will also utilize Foundations to explicitly teach phonics in conjunction with Geodes, both rich standards aligned materials. School-wide we will utilize iReady instructional minutes as a Tier 2 intervention and Tier 3 MTSS students will be pulled into small groups 4-5 times a week with a content area expert (Math Coach, Literacy Coach & Curriculum Resource Teacher).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

All strategies above, LLI, SIPPS, iReady, Wit & Wisdom, Foundations, & Geodes, are research based, proven effective for closing reading gaps, and meet the differing needs of learners. Our master schedule also allows for students in the lower 50% to get these strategies during different times of the day. Research supports having access to all tiers of the intervention system in order to achieve the desired outcome of closing the achievement gap and bringing students to proficiency in reading.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Design Master Schedule to accommodate intervention needs

**Person Responsible**

Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Implement LLI & Train LLI interventionists

**Person Responsible**

Michelle Wiseman (wisemanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Address MTSS process concerns & Train staff on appropriate protocol and processes.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Tatar (tatarm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Identify students currently in the MTSS system & create groups for intervention

**Person Responsible** Kristy Beach (beachk1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Create time and protocols for community learning for teachers and staff to learn and plan for strong instruction utilizing materials aligned to the standards.

**Person Responsible** Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Monitor iReady minutes to ensure teachers are facilitating students meeting the school-wide expectation.

**Person Responsible** Kristy Beach (beachk1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide and organize quarterly half day planning for teachers of grades K-5 in order to ensure planning for strong instruction and collaboration is taking place.

**Person Responsible** Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Create a learning walk schedule for Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Math Coach, and CRT to walk classrooms weekly. All members of the walking team will walk both the intervention block as well as the instructional block. The goal is 10 classrooms per week.

**Person Responsible** Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate learning walk debrief meetings to come up with next steps for areas of concern, celebrate high areas, and discuss progress of current work.

**Person Responsible** Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**Eustis Elementary's discipline data is significantly lower than the states. The discipline progression put in place allows for multiple behavioral interventions prior to discipline referrals as well as a focus on restorative practices to build the character and decision making of students. The environment at EES is one of high expectations and love for all students leading to solid student, teacher, parent relationships which positively affects student behavior.**



## 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.

In order to kick off this school year we started with three campus clean up days to beautify this historic school. We had numerous staff and teachers come out throughout those days to get our campus ready for students and staff. We had such a great turnout that staff and community members asked for additional days to come out and finish projects that were incomplete. We were able to double the size of our text book room and clean and reorganize it to welcome the new curriculum. We successfully created a custodial room to house and organize all of our custodial staffs tools and items. We also had our front walk ways and main court yard pressure washed and all of the landscaping was given a facelift making it presentable and welcoming. We also restructured the basement to create the "dug out" where we will be able to come together as a community of learners to plan, learn, and meet.

During pre planning we also did team building by partnering with our Lakeside Lanes and took the entire staff bowling. To continue to foster the development of teams and collaboration we created a "Traveling Trophy" where staff will continue to compete in events both academic and physical. Our school as partnered with three different churches that provided us breakfast during two days as well as lunch. The final day we continued to celebrate the new school year by having an "Opening Ceremony" where teams competed in three events, cornhole, yard jenga and an egg toss.

We will also continue to have an ongoing teacher VALUE program where once a month we will quietly do something for the staff to celebrate them and their continuous hard work.

### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

We have an abundance of stakeholder support at EES. We have partnered with multiple area churches who have adopted us and provide us with breakfast, lunch and monetary donations to meet all of our needs. We have an established PTO and SAC that will continue to make positive decisions for our students and raise funds to give back to our students and staff. Our teachers and staff will continue to engage in our collective beliefs to promote our positive school culture and support our mission and vision. Those beliefs were created by teachers and staff during the first day of preplanning and are as follows:

- Integrity
- Treat every child like your own
- Encourage talents of all students
- Teach with a purpose
- Authenticity: celebrating teachers and students
- Perseverance through hard times
- Believe in yourself

- Be there for others and lean into each other
- Perspective: Have faith for a new day
- Love before learning: create security for all students

## Part V: Budget

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

|        |          |   |   |                          |     |            |            |
|--------|----------|---|---|--------------------------|-----|------------|------------|
| 1      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction |   |                          |     |            | \$0.00     |
| 2      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems          |   |                          |     |            | \$2,780.00 |
|        | Function | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2021-22    |            |
|        | 5100     |   | 0061 - Eustis Elementary School   | School Improvement Funds |     | \$2,780.00 |            |
|        |          |   | Notes: One School One Book Literacy Program   |                          |     |            |            |
| 3      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation               |   |                          |     |            | \$1,567.00 |
|        | Function | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2021-22    |            |
|        | 5100     |   | 0061 - Eustis Elementary School   | School Improvement Funds |     | \$1,567.00 |            |
|        |          |   | Notes: K-2 Tutoring of students that are not progressing towards proficiency and need additional support. This will be basedo on mid-year data reports. |                          |     |            |            |
| 4      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                           |   |                          |     |            | \$0.00     |
| Total: |          |   |   |                          |     | \$4,347.00 |            |