

Lake County Schools

Eustis Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Eustis Middle School

18725 BATES AVE, Eustis, FL 32736

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

Demographics

Principal: Michael Spencer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Eustis Middle School

18725 BATES AVE, Eustis, FL 32736

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

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.

At Eustis Middle School, we desire to foster a safe, positive and engaging learning environment for our students, which promotes the value of an education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eustis Middle School is the home of a faculty, staff, and student body who believe in each other's willingness to grow and adapt, in order to meet the challenges faced by today's students.

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
Crosby, Abigail	Principal	Leadership and APs, master schedule, SAC, supervision schedule, 7th grade evaluations
Durias, Herman	Assistant Principal	Health Coordinator, School safety, CTE, Field trips, Facilities, AVID, 8th grade
Phillips, James	Assistant Principal	Professional development, Title 1, Testing, PBIS, Guidance, 6th grade
Williams, Rhoda	Administrative Support	
Cassidy, Whitney	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Michael Spencer

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Total number of students enrolled at the school

843

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

1

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

1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	244	288	311	0	0	0	0	843
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	68	93	0	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	27	20	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	60	88	0	0	0	0	190
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	88	83	0	0	0	0	237
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	0	0	0	0	0	122	219	191	0	0	0	0	532

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	46	54	0	0	0	0	129
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/11/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	234	248	235	0	0	0	0	717
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	15	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	15	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	68	112	0	0	0	0	251
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	78	84	0	0	0	0	246

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	256	275	0	0	0	0	753

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	234	248	235	0	0	0	0	717
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	15	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	15	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	68	112	0	0	0	0	251
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	78	84	0	0	0	0	246

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	256	275	0	0	0	0	753

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				45%	50%	54%	46%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	52%	54%	51%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	44%	47%	42%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				51%	56%	58%	55%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains				51%	55%	57%	61%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	46%	51%	47%	47%	51%
Science Achievement				44%	49%	51%	53%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				62%	70%	72%	69%	72%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	43%	52%	-9%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	52%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	44%	53%	-9%	55%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	14%	39%	-25%	46%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	41%	49%	-8%	48%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	60%	71%	-11%	71%	-11%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	90%	52%	38%	61%	29%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

LSA Quarterly, first percentage is our average score compared to District average score.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48/51	42/45	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55/57	48/53	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49/53	48/53	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45/49	37/40	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48/53	45/52	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		48/51	44/47	
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners				
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		32/34	30/32	
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners				
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		53/56	45/52	
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners				

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	17	28	29	18	30	33	14	33	62		
ELL	25	41	46	30	36	21	13	52			
BLK	22	26	22	26	32	25	30	44	69		
HSP	40	42	46	41	43	24	30	65	80		
MUL	32	45		30	36	50	50	50	67		
WHT	49	47	42	59	57	47	48	64	82		
FRL	32	35	37	37	42	33	34	53	77		
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	18	31	27	23	37	36	19	38			
ELL	12	30	32	27	40	47	10	47			
BLK	35	40	35	35	44	34	33	44	74		

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	37	45	40	44	49	40	36	58	80		
MUL	58	50		51	56			81	93		
WHT	53	47	40	62	54	36	52	69	79		
FRL	37	43	39	43	47	38	33	53	70		

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	16	33	29	21	39	40	20	43			
ELL	15	55	55	26	43	32		50			
BLK	32	46	40	38	49	34	24	76	77		
HSP	42	53	52	51	62	56	58	55	65		
MUL	54	48		56	69	70	69	82			
WHT	53	53	36	64	65	48	59	72	82		
FRL	39	48	42	49	57	47	44	64	72		

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	491
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	37
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	33
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	45
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	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	46
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?

Based on our FSA data 8th grade ELA proficiency, 6th grade math, and math learning gains and lowest quartile making learning gains are the three most critical areas of focus. This Area of Focus was identified at a critical area of need because we dropped 8 percentage points on 8th grade ELA proficiency, 8 percentage points in 6th grade math, and 5 percentage points in math learning gains and lowest quartile making learning gains. We did also see an increase in 8th grade math proficiency from 14%(2019) to 32%.

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

6th grade math proficiency, learning gains, and lowest quartile learning gains.

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

Based off FSA data and to increase achievement in math, three math teachers will each have a section of intensive math where they will teach during his or her plan periods.

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

8th grade Math, Algebra, 6th grade ELA.

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

Weekly tutoring provided by our 8th grade math and Algebra teachers which targeted remediation areas based off ALEKS progress checks and class assignments.

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

We will be offering a 7th grade advanced math to 6th graders, algebra to 7th graders, and geometry to 8th graders face to face. In addition, we will be implementing an acceleration option for Mustang block which is our 30 minute period a day reserved for every student to either participate in remediation, intervention, or acceleration.

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.

Modeling lowest quartile data chats by coaches. learning walks through mustang blocks based on best practice and expert teachers. Allowing students to learn the same content/subject from a different teacher who has data of showing students mastering.

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

Three sections of intensive math, an extra section of intensive reading with additional hours of MTSS, tutoring before school, mustang block universal time slot.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on our FSA data 8th grade ELA proficiency, 6th grade math proficiency, math learning gains, and lowest quartile making learning gains are the three most critical areas of focus. This Area of Focus was identified at a critical area of need because we dropped 8 percentage points on 8th grade ELA proficiency, 8 percentage points in 6th grade math, and 5 percentage points in math learning gains and lowest quartile making learning gains. After this past year, collaborative learning will be a focus point during classroom walk throughs. In addition, we will be using an AVID tutor to support all three grade levels. We will also be supporting our math and ELA classrooms with supplies including mini whiteboards, dry erase markers/erasers/spray, sticky notes, pencils, highlighters, and class sets of calculators. Last, we will be supporting more classrooms with additional interactive TV displays.

Measurable Outcome:

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in our quarter LSAs, pre/post APMs, and mid-year from 2021 to 2022 of an average increase of 6 percentage points. In addition, we hope to see an increase of 10% of evidence showing collaborative learning compared to last year.

Monitoring:

Department quarterly data chats on LSA, APM data, lowest quartile bubble chats, and mustang block classroom walk through data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Abigail Crosby (crosbya@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Modeling, utilizing, and implementing a protocol of unpacking standards and developing common assessments based off identifying what standards have not been mastered.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This will let the data drive the action plan for our mustang block used for remediation, interventions, and acceleration.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule quarterly department data chats by grade level
2. Analyze and desegregate data by different sub groups
2. Identify bubble students on lowest quartile list
3. Monthly check-ins with MTSS
4. Classroom walk throughs

Person Responsible

Abigail Crosby (crosbya@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our EWS data showed two disparities of 51% of students (454) had a final grade of a D or F. In addition we had 7% of students (59) receive 1 or more days OSS.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see a decrease in final grade D or Fs and OSS by 5% in both categories.
Monitoring:	Monthly discipline data will be shared at department and team leader meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Herman Durias (duriash@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBIS team will be implementing an action plan that will be meeting every second Tuesday of the month to discuss data, incentives, stakeholder input, and disparities in subgroup data with discipline.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Creating school wide culture that offers discipline expectations, intervention strategies for teachers to build relationships, and an administrative discipline ladder based on restorative practices.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule monthly PBIS meetings
2. Discipline forms updated including positive referral
3. Track monthly discipline data
4. Monitor EWS with monthly meetings

Person Responsible James Phillips (phillipsj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our FSA data overall math learning gains, and overall lowest quartile making learning gains are the two most critical areas of focus. This Area of Focus was identified at a critical area of need because we dropped 5 percentage points in math learning gains and lowest quartile making learning gains. After this past year, mustang block will be a major focus point as we offer remediation, interventions, and acceleration opportunities school wide.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in our quarter LSAs, pre/post APMs, and mid-year from 2021 to 2022 of an average increase of 5 percentage points.

Monitoring: Mustang block will be monitored by weekly walk through by leadership, innovative ideas for teachers to use, and promoting a school wide culture of where every student has the ability to "walk" to a mustang block.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: James Phillips (phillipsj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Allowing teachers to select what mustang block options there students have and can sign up for based off data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be able to schedule different material, content, standards based off of common assessments. Leadership will be able to use the flex time manager to monitor what every teacher is offering during mustang block, perform classroom walk throughs, and analyze results to make sure the time is productive.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Design a universal 30 minute block into master schedule
2. Train staff and leadership on flex time manager
3. Implement a "walking" mustang block as a warm-up
4. Implement mustang block using flex time manager
5. Monitor results from LSA/APM quarterly assessments/course grades/EWS

Person Responsible: Herman Durias (duriash@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.

The PBIS team will be tracking discipline data and monitoring inappropriate behaviors.

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.

Eustis Middle School builds a positive school culture and environment in several ways. First, we be taking a proactive approach to promote positive behaviors with our PBIS team using best practices to prevent unwanted behaviors, build teacher-student relationships, and utilize restorative practices. Second, EMS is excited to be able to do face to face events to help including an open house and curriculum night, an in-house STEAM night literacy night, 6th grade orientation, and other title 1 family engagement nights.

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

EMS also meets with Kiwanis Club, city council members, Lake Cares, and other key community members throughout the school year. In addition the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) is a committee with many stakeholders including parents, community members, teachers, administrators, and other school staff members. Our SAC is open to any stakeholder and offers monthly meetings where input is gathered and school decisions are discussed and voted on.

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	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00