

Lake County Schools

# Eustis Heights 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>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>28</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>29</b> |

# Eustis Heights Elementary School

310 W TAYLOR AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Terri Soos**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2019

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <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>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: D (34%)<br>2016-17: C (43%)  |
| <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, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](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>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>29</b> |

# Eustis Heights Elementary School

310 W TAYLOR AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

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

## School Demographics

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">68%</p>                |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

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

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

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

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

| Name           | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------|----------------|--|
| Scott, Tiffany | Principal      | <p>The school leadership team consists of the Principal, two Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselor, Literacy Coach, Math/ Science Coach, MTSS Coach, ESE Specialist, Instructional Dean, PASS Teacher, Mental Health Liaison, Instructional Technology, and Potential Specialist. The function and responsibility of each school leadership team member is to create a system of supports for both the classroom teacher and individual students according to the intervention design outlined in the MTSS process.</p> <p>More specifically, the role of administration is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oversee, evaluate, and provide assistance as instructional leaders for all instructional and non-instructional staff.</li> <li>2. Oversee the MTSS process, implementation, and procedures.</li> <li>3. Provide strategies, interventions, resources for teachers to implement for students, and to monitor the progress of each student.</li> <li>4. Secure necessary resources to ensure to ensure all teachers are successful, which in turn will lead to student success.</li> <li>5. Oversee and provide support to manage IEP's, ensure compliance, conduct IEP meetings, problem solve, and support ESE teachers and students.</li> </ol> <p>The leadership team meets weekly to discuss/report the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Core instruction alignment among grade levels (instructional planning and delivery is standards-based, data-driven, and differentiated instruction)<br/> **Person(s) responsible: Literacy coach, Math/Science Coach, and Administration</li> <li>2. Small group instruction is skill specific for student needs based upon data.<br/> **Person(s) responsible: Potential Specialist, Literacy Coach, Math/Science Coach, and Administration</li> <li>3. School-wide data driven professional learning</li> </ol> |



| Name               | Position Title            | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|
|                    |                           | communities.<br>(SIPPS, iReady, ALEKS, Performance Matters Assessments, Teacher Made Assessments and Student Grades.)<br>**Person(s) responsible: Potential Specialist, Literacy Coach,<br>Math/Science Coach, & Administration<br>4. Early Warning Systems (Attendance, Discipline, and PBS)<br>**Person(s) responsible: Administration, Potential Specialist, and Guidance<br>5. Lowest Quartile Data Tracking and Retained Students<br>**Person(s) responsible: Potential Specialist, MTSS Coach,<br>Administration and Guidance<br>6. MTSS Status<br>**Person(s) Responsible: MTSS Coach and Administration<br>7. ESE/ELL Status<br>**Person(s) responsible: ESE Specialist & MTSS Coach<br>8. Professional Learning Communities<br>**Person(s) responsible: Administration, Literacy Coach, and Math/Science Coach<br>9. Professional Development Needs<br>**Person(s) responsible: Administration, Literacy Coach, and Math/Science Coach<br>10. Support/Celebrations<br>**Person(s) responsible: All Members |
| Soos, Terri        | Assistant Principal       | Assistant Principal   |
| Peterkin, Andrie   | Assistant Principal       | Assistant Principal   |
| Ward, Ashley       | School Counselor          | School Counselor  |
| Wolfe, Kacy        | Instructional Coach       | Literacy Coach  |
| Flint, Mikel A.    | Instructional Coach       | MTSS Coach  |
| Bellefleur, Eileen | Teacher, ESE              | ESE Specialist  |
| Bob, Linda         | Parent Engagement Liaison | PASS Teacher & Liaison  |

| Name                  | Position Title           | Job Duties and Responsibilities                                 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Martin Eubanks, Linda | Other                    | Potential Specialist who serves as our Academic Interventionist |
| Taylor, Aja A.        | Instructional Technology | Media Specialist  |
| Martinez, Janet       | Other                    | Mental Health Liaison   |
| Coulter, Rebecca      | Instructional Coach      | Instructional Coach (Math/Science)                              |
| Durbin, John          | Dean                     | Instructional Dean  |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Saturday 8/10/2019, Terri Soos

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

2

**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.*

15

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

57

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

639

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

12

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

12

**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                              | 93          | 87 | 102 | 94 | 118 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 600   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 37 | 36  | 35 | 41  | 35  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 184   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 6  | 4   | 9  | 6   | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 5           | 9  | 6   | 14 | 31  | 13  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 3           | 3  | 6   | 16 | 11  | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0   | 21 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0   | 22 | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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           | 21 | 21 | 25 | 83 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 208   |

**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     | 7           | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/12/2021

**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               | 65          | 79 | 69 | 96 | 79 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 473   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 16 | 21 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 70    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 1  | 6  | 3  | 8  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 4  | 7  | 2  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 4  | 7  | 2  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 30          | 49 | 44 | 54 | 53 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 307   |

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

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

**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               | 65          | 79 | 69 | 96 | 79 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 473   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 16 | 21 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 70    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 1  | 6  | 3  | 8  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 4  | 7  | 2  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 4  | 7  | 2  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 30          | 49 | 44 | 54 | 53 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 307   |

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

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

**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             |        |          |       | 48%    | 58%      | 57%   | 39%    | 59%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 57%    | 57%      | 58%   | 42%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 54%    | 49%      | 53%   | 19%    | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 53%    | 60%      | 63%   | 44%    | 63%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 51%    | 56%      | 62%   | 42%    | 54%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 34%    | 39%      | 51%   | 24%    | 41%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 47%    | 54%      | 53%   | 30%    | 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 | 49%    | 60%      | -11%                       | 58%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 46%    | 60%      | -14%                       | 58%   | -12%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -49%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 59%      | -8%                        | 56%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -46%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 62%      | 2%                         | 62%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 61%      | -10%                       | 64%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -64%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 43%    | 57%      | -14%                       | 60%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -51%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 47%    | 56%      | -9%                        | 53%   | -6%                     |
| 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 to provide the data below is as follows:

- \* K-2 ELA & Math -iReady (Fall, Winter, Spring)
- \*3 - 5 ELA & Math iReady (Fall and Winter) and FSA (Spring)
- \* 5th Grade Science -LSA Data (Q1 and Q3) and NGSS (Spring)

| <b>Grade 1</b>        |   |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency                                  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students  | 18   | 28     | 48     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 6    | 17     | 44     |
|                       | English Language Learners                             | 0    | 36     | 36     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency                                  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students  | 13   | 25     | 53     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 0    | 6      | 50     |
|                       | English Language Learners                             | 0    | 27     | 55     |

| <b>Grade 2</b>        |   |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency                                  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students  | 14   | 24     | 32     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 0    | 11     | 20     |
|                       | English Language Learners                             | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency                                  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students  | 8    | 9      | 22     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 6    | 0      | 15     |
|                       | English Language Learners                             | 0    | 0      | 0      |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 28   | 42     | 36     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0    | 23     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 6      |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 12   | 35     | 44     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0    | 9      |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 6      |        |

| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 29   | 43     | 45     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0    | 19     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 13   | 33     | 51     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 5    | 14     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      |        |

| Grade 5               |                            |                      |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |                      | 24   | 35     | 43     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | 10   | 13     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | 9    | 18     |        |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |                      | 13   | 34     | 46     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | 10   | 10     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | 27   | 27     |        |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               |                      | 39   | 35     | 37     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | 15   | 27     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | 49   | 43     |        |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 20       | 32     | 25          | 27        | 26      | 24           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 18       |        |             | 36        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 21       | 36     |             | 23        | 25      | 10           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 32       | 47     | 50          | 44        | 47      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 68       |        |             | 72        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 52       | 57     |             | 67        | 46      |              | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 35       | 48     | 47          | 43        | 39      | 25           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 26       | 35     | 30          | 27        | 42      | 38           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 39     | 29          | 46        | 38      | 31           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 31       | 50     | 59          | 30        | 37      | 30           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |



| 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 |
| HSP                                       | 47       | 52     | 35          | 59        | 52      | 32           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 47       | 62     |             | 63        | 62      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 61       | 65     | 77          | 60        | 57      | 50           | 74       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 55     | 50          | 49        | 48      | 31           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 17       | 26     | 17          | 20        | 30      | 17           | 10       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 24       | 44     |             | 32        | 35      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 33     | 19          | 26        | 32      | 26           | 22       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 33       | 41     | 12          | 41        | 41      | 23           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 53       | 58     |             | 59        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 55       | 50     |             | 64        | 57      | 17           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 36       | 40     | 19          | 41        | 41      | 25           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| 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                                    | 3   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 344 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 25  |
| 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                                       | 40  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                | 23  |
| 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  | 47  |
| 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   | 70  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| 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   | 53  |
| 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                                | 41 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| 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?

Trends that emerge across grade levels include low proficiency rates for all grade levels in the area of ELA, Math and Science. Additionally, Black, ELL and ESE students are not growing at a rate comparable to their peers.

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

The data component that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement is Math Lowest 25th Percentile with 34% during the 2018-19 school year and 24% during the 2017-18 school year. Although this is an increase in student performance as compared to the previous year, it is at least a 13% difference from the other school grade components.

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

One of the contributing factors to this need for improvement was not providing students with adequate time on remedial math skills. The new action needed for improvement would be to ensure that adequate time is allotted for remedial math skills. In addition, we will need to ensure that the remediation time is of high quality and occurring consistently in each grade.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile was the data component that showed the most improvement moving from 19% during the 2017-18 school year to 54% during the 2018-19 school year, a 35% difference.

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

This year there were several actions that contributed to this change. During the 2018-19 we utilized the Leveled Literacy Intervention program to support our lowest quartile and dedicated time and human capital to ensure that the systems ran daily based on the allotted within the schedule. Staff administering the program were trained on how to implement the program and the program was monitored with fidelity. Additionally, our district DA support team provide consistent feedback resulting in stronger monitoring and targeted improvements based on timely feedback.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will need to strengthen our core instruction and improve our Multi-Tiered System of Supports.

**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.**

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders include:

1. MTSS/Intervention Support
2. Small Group & Guided Instruction
3. ELA, Math & Science Content Training
4. Grade Appropriate Assignments, Deep Engagement, Strong Instruction & High Expectations
5. PLC Framework

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

Additional Services include the following:

1. Teacher leaders lead and facilitate common planning while coaches support and ensure alignment to district instructional framework. This will help maintain instructional momentum from year to year with minimal teacher attrition.
2. Strengthen instructional feedback to teachers and coaches with both quality and quantity.
3. Intentionally focus on recruiting and retaining effective and highly effective teachers.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan, and deliver standards based instruction where students can state what they are learning, why they are learning it and how they know they have learned it. Strong collaborative planning around strong standards based instruction will ensure that grade appropriate task and quality instruction is consistently delivered. This thoughtful planning will ensure the instructional needs of our under performing subgroups (SWD, Black, ELL), and all students will be met. The data shows that we are improving from year to year but our proficiency rate is below 50% in almost all subgroups other than our white students in ELA and Math. This suggest that the core (standards based instruction) can use an improvement when less than 50% of our students are not meeting proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase Reading, Writing, Thinking and Talking across all content areas and build capacity in the six Marzano elements as evidenced by quarterly increases and also doubling the percent of learning walk tool look-fors from baseline to mid-year learning walks; Recruit and retain highly effective teachers by supporting a collaborative student-centered environment that provides access and utilization of state of the art educational technology. Increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 48% to 51%, ELA Learning Gains from 57% to 60%, Math Proficiency from 53% to 56%, Math Learning Gains from 51% to 54%, and Science Proficiency from 47% to 50%. Additionally, we will improve teacher retention from 79% (46/58) to 91% (53/58).

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored through administration and coaches participating in weekly common planning; observing instruction to monitor for transfer from planning to instruction; and a tracking tool to determine how we spend the majority of our time in PLCs with regard to the four questions. Findings from all observations will be discussed in the leadership team meetings where next steps will be determined.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tiffany Scott (scottt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence-based strategy that will be used is engaging in collaborative planning twice per week. This strategy will be monitored through consistent participation within PLCs, PLC forms (include agenda, minutes, participants, and follow up task(s), and classroom walkthroughs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale behind this strategy is that if teachers, administrators and coaches consistently engage in PLCs that focus on purpose, developing quality tasks and coherent instructional delivery in a cycle that will allow them to plan, teach, analyze and apply their findings, we will reduce equity gaps among classes. This cycle is expected to narrow the focus around standards based instruction, and increase teacher competency. Additionally, we will be able to intentionally and consistently provide quality learning experiences for all students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

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

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

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

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

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Coulter (coulterr@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

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

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

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Coulter (coulterr@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

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

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By utilizing student achievement data, Eustis Heights Elementary will tailor interventions and accelerations for all students in Reading, Math, and Science to increase student achievement among all student to include our student under performing in key subgroups (Black, ELL, SWD). Tailoring interventions and accelerations for all students will allow us to meet the individual needs of each students allowing us to close achievement gaps. The data reveals that while we have made progress in improving learning gains we are still below the federal index for SWD, ELL, and Black. Providing more specific accelerations and interventions will allow us to improve student outcomes and more accurately meet their learning needs.

**Measurable Outcome:** The measurable outcome that EHES plans to achieve is an increase in student achievement in ELA Achievement from 48% to 51%, ELA Learning Gains from 57% to 60%, ELA Lowest Quartile from 54% to 57%, Math Achievement from 53% to 56%, Math Learning Gains from 51% to 54%, Math Lowest Quartile from 34% to 50%, and Science Achievement from 47% to 50%.

**Monitoring:** This are of focus will be monitored by walking intervention weekly and analyzing the quality of instruction in weekly leadership meetings. During those meetings next steps to include professional development needs will be determined during that time.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Linda Martin Eubanks (eubanksl@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence based strategy is providing students with systematic interventions that will remediate or accelerate student learning based on their individual needs using small group instruction, Fountas & Pinnell- Leveled Literacy Intervention, Foundations, Rosetta Stone, SIPPS, iReady Reading & Math,and ALEKS.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale behind this strategy is that if students are provided the time within a school day to receive systematic support (interventions/ accelerations) in addition to core instruction, students will be able to recover learning gaps while building current grade level knowledge and skills. This strategy will allow all students including the lowest quartile, and students in critical need subgroups (SWD, ELL, Black) to get their individual learning needs met, resulting in higher student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

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

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

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

Conduct weekly walk-through to monitor for implementation and fidelity of interventions during the intervention block, What I Need Time (W.I.N Time).

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

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

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

Build instructional capacity among our leadership team around small group instruction by engaging in a book study on "Teaching Reading in Small Groups: Differentiated Instruction for Building Strategic, Independent Readers and Making Sense of Mathematics for Teaching the Small Group."

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

Recruit, hire, and train a tutor during the day to support small group instruction in Math/ELA using SAI funds.

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



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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By utilizing early warning systems data, Eustis Heights Elementary will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students. These elements have a direct correlation to student achievement. Therefore by improving these elements we are creating a stronger foundation for learning and cultivating an environment for which students can thrive.

**Measurable Outcome:** The intended outcome is to reduce the number of students meeting the EWS for absences and maintain 7% or less each quarter. Additionally, we will increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 48% to 51%, ELA Learning Gains from 57% to 60%, Math Proficiency from 53% to 56%, Math Learning Gains from 51% to 54%, ELA Lowest Quartile Learning gains from 54% to 57%; Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 34% to 50%, and Science proficiency from 47% to 50%.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through the weekly review of early warning sign data. Additionally, the leadership team will identify trends in the data and problem solve for both preventative and responsive intervention.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Andrie Peterkin (peterkina@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence based strategy that we will be used is the implementation of a school wide positive behavior plan that will offer incentives for students demonstrating desired positive behaviors and monitors early warning sign data to intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors. We will also increase home to school communication by providing more opportunities for families to be involved.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If we implement, monitor and support practices that will foster a positive and supportive learning environment than attendance will increase. Additionally, building relationships with families increase communication and support from home to support students academically.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Implement a school-wide positive behavior plan.  
**Person Responsible** John Durbin (durbinj@lake.k12.fl.us)

The positive behavior support team will monitor EWS data and provide supports to students when and where needed.  
**Person Responsible** John Durbin (durbinj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide faculty and staff with professional development on Zones of Regulation and Restorative Practices so that it may be implemented school wide.  
**Person Responsible** Janet Martinez (martinezj5@lake.k12.fl.us)

Utilize services and staff such as our Mental Health Liaison, Positive Alternative School Suspension Teacher, and Guidance Counselor to support our neediest students.  
**Person Responsible** Andrie Peterkin (peterkina@lake.k12.fl.us)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By providing targeted ELA instruction, supports and interventions in K-5 using research based strategies with fidelity, we will increase the number of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2022 ELA standardized assessments. We will also increase the number of students performing on grade level on the end of year iReady assessments. According to the data, in 1st - 5th grade less than 50% of our students are performing on or above grade level in ELA on the end of year state and district assessment. Per ELA EOY iReady results 49% of 1st grade and 32% of 2nd grade were on or above grade. Per the 2021 FSA ELA assessment, 36% of 3rd grade, 45% of 4th grade, and 43% of 5th grade were on or above grade level. Based on this data, we believe that the consistent implementation of quality instruction along with research based interventions in ELA and monitoring, we will be able to increase the number of students who demonstrate proficiency on the above district and state ELA assessments.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome will be measured in student performance data. Our aim is to increase the percentage of 3rd grade students scoring a level 3 or higher on the statewide assessment from 36% to 40%. Increase the percentage of 4th grade students scoring a level 3 or higher on the statewide assessment from 45% to 49%. Increase the percentage of 5th grade students scoring a level 3 or higher on the statewide assessment from 43% to 47%. Increase the percentage of 1st grade students scoring on or above grade level based on the EOY iReady assessment from 49% to 53%. Increase the percentage of 2nd grade students scoring on or above grade level based on the EOY iReady assessment from 32% to 36%.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus must be monitored using multiple approaches. The intervention team will conduct weekly walkthroughs during core instruction and interventions using the district instructional framework walkthrough tool, analyze the data for trends and determine a plan of action based on the opportunities observed. Additionally, the team will analyze the effectiveness of the intervention by reviewing pre/post data for interventions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tiffany Scott (scottt1@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence bases strategy being used in this plan includes the following:  
 1. Implementing high quality core ELA materials (Wit & Wisdom) that are aligned to the science of reading and integration of content rich texts.  
 2. Plan reading instruction using the 6 core components of reading using the 120 minute district literacy block.  
 3. Collaborative planning twice per week using Rick DuFour's research practices and guiding questions.  
 4. Utilize Foundations to teach phonics instruction explicitly and systematically.  
 5. Utilize data to drive interventions using small group instruction specific to students' needs and additional personnel in core instruction to provide additional instructional support.  
 6. Utilize research based resources during intervention to include Foundations/Geodes, LLI/ SIPPS, and/or iReady Teacher Directed Lessons.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale behind each of these strategies is that with less than 50% of a grade level meeting proficiency, it is necessary to improve the quality of instruction as a whole to improve student learning outcomes for all students. However, improving the quality of instruction alone is not enough. Understanding that providing students with interventions will allow us to differentiate instruction and recover academic loss in all students but

especially those 2 or more grade levels behind. Finally, in order to improve the quality of instruction and to provide interventions with quality we must adequately plan for instruction and interventions using best practices and monitor the effectiveness using relevant data. Collectively these strategies will increase student learning and retention, and ultimately increase the number of students demonstrating proficiency on district and statewide assessments.

### Action Steps to Implement

Establish an intervention team, its purpose and the role of each member.

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

Meet weekly with the intervention team to review data, problem solve, conduct class walkthroughs with feedback using the district instructional framework, and norm our practice.

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

Develop a common planning schedule, intervention schedule, and a core instructional support schedule. Ensure the consistent implementation of each schedule.

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

Provide training and professional development on PLCs, curriculum implementation (Wit & Wisdom/ Foundations/Geodes, iReady Teacher Directed Lessons), intervention materials and focus map, small group instruction, and other high yield strategies to teachers and those providing interventions as needed.

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

Meet with teachers who lead collaborative planning monthly to practice two-way communication and identify barriers to intervention and/or the delivery of consistent and quality instruction.

**Person Responsible** Tiffany Scott (scottt1@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.

**Based on the Safe Schools for Alex data, EHES ranks #577 out of #1,395, with an overall moderate rating. Although EHES is below the state average on most indicators, a few areas of concern remain. The primary concern is the number of suspensions for the 20-21 SY with a total of 71 (45 in-school and 26 out-of-school). The secondary concern is the 2 violent incidents reported as a threat or intimidation. As a school community we will work to reduce the suspension and violent incident numbers by being proactive and educating our students on conflict resolution as well as restorative practices. The Leadership Team will review the data (suspension and infraction type) monthly to discuss any interventions and/or supports needed through problem solving. Dr. Tiffany Scott, Principal, along with Andrie Peterkin, Assistant Principal, will supervise this effort.**

## 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.

At Eustis Heights we strive to build a positive school culture and environment in a variety of ways to include:

1. Practicing two-way communication with our families, and using every opportunity to keep them informed about what's happening on campus.
  2. Creating a warm environment for students and stakeholders alike by creating the best customer service experience (addressing them by name and a smile, following up promptly with concerns).
  3. Remaining visible to the public. Admin remaining visible to staff and providing monthly treats or pick me ups to let the know they are appreciated.
  4. Celebrate our wins together.
  5. Provide a space for teachers and staff to express concerns.
  6. Provide stability with consistent expectations.
  7. Make every effort to recruit and retain staff that are effective instructionally and also build relationships with students.
  8. Ensuring the facility is clean and presentable. Requiring all stakeholders to treat the facility and the people within it with care.
  9. Provide every staff member with specific feedback throughout the school year.
  10. Establish a clear mission and vision, and connect our work to the big picture consistently.
  11. Provide faculty and staff with opportunities to learn from one another and build capacity.
  12. Referring to the leadership team as the support team, as to model servant leadership.
  13. Promote positive clubs, activities and student involvement.
  14. Host quarterly events for faculty and staff to fellowship outside of school.
  15. Publicly recognize staff for a skill they bring to the school family.
  16. Utilize a love language inventory for staff so that we know how each staff member feels appreciated.
- Each team member and support team member use that to encourage and motivate the school family.

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

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

1. Quarterly parent/grandparent support classes.

2. Community and Family Input with the Title I Plan, Parent Involvement Plan, and School Compact.
3. Parent Teacher Conference Nights twice a year.
4. Title 1 Survey and follow up meetings.
5. Increase virtual communication using all social media outlets to provide for two-way communication.
6. Continue partnerships with local organizations to ensure our neediest families receive, books, school supplies, clothes, food, and other resources.
7. Actively recruit, retain, and meet with our PTO and SAC while addressing current issues through all stakeholder input.
8. Host virtual events where face-to-face communications are not present.
9. Send home monthly news letters in English and Spanish.
10. Work with our feeder pattern middle school to arrange for visitations/orientation days for our outgoing 5th grade students to include ESE students.
11. Partner with child care centers and invite them to visit classes and our school in preparation for PreK and Kindergarten transitions and share PreK and KG readiness goals.
12. Conduct meet the teachers, curriculum nights, and Annual Title I Meetings.
13. Host special events to build community and celebrate student success(Movie Night, Honor Roll Ceremonies, Intervention Ceremonies, Terrific Kid, etc.).
14. Conduct home visits as needed.
15. Host monthly family dinner nights where educational resources are provided in addition to a free meal.
16. Open the Parent Resource Center where parents can check out a variety of resources to support student learning and encourage literacy in the home.
17. Provide school based and community mentors for at-risk youth or students with more than 2 Early Warning Signs.
18. Utilize volunteers at school events (Class Readers, Tiger Loot Day, Career Day, Field Day, etc.).

**Part V: Budget**

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

|               |        |  |               |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1             | III.A. | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| 2             | III.A. | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation</b>               | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| 3             | III.A. | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Early Warning Systems</b>      | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| 4             | III.A. | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>                           | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |