Eustis Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Eustis Elementary School

714 E CITRUS AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boardway, Reanna	Principal	
Scott, Tushena	Assistant Principal	
Beach, Kristy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Tatar, Michelle	Other	
Wiseman, Michelle	Other	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school advisory council will be used to involve all stakeholders for the development of the SIP. We will advertise the SAC via Facebook and do a call out for participation.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored regularly by the members of the leadership team through monthly progress meetings. Adjustments will be made if adequate progress is not being attained.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	6	6	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	2	0	5	13	2	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	6	17	16	29	21	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in Math	6	17	16	29	21	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	32	33	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	25	34	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	14	23	29	24	0	0	0	97

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	12	4	17	44	33	0	0	0	0	110

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	1	16	20	12	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	32	26	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	36	32	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	10	18	30	0	0	0	60

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	2	5	7	6	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	1	16	20	12	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	32	26	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	36	32	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	10	18	30	0	0	0	60

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	2	5	7	6	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	47	53	41	50	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				48			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			46		
Math Achievement*	52	55	59	52	46	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				53			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			31		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	53	52	54	46	52	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	61	59	55			39		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	236
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	20	Yes	3	1
ELL	33	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	20	Yes	3	1
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	43			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	34	Yes	2	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	37			52			53					53
SWD	12			19			19				4	
ELL	14			33							3	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16			28			27				4	
HSP	35			51			53				5	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54			70			68				4	
FRL	32			48			50				5	50

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	41	48	43	52	53	50	46					55
SWD	17	48	53	23	35	29	33					
ELL	29	44		43	28							55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	42	50	35	52	50	13					
HSP	45	50	36	55	47		55					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	51		63	57		64					
FRL	39	46	43	47	52	52	40					53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	38	46	52	34	31	53					39
SWD	23	50		30			20					
ELL	30			35								39

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	24		32	24		29					
HSP	43	54		50	58		43					41
MUL	40			20								
PAC												
WHT	61	35		73	32		74					
FRL	45	41	50	41	33	33	39					38

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	54%	-13%	58%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	50%	-12%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	51%	0%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data that showed the lowest performance was 3rd grade ELA with 38% proficiency and 4th and 5th grade with a close 41%.

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

3rd grade ELA showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Many factors contributed to the lack of proficiency including, the normal SES, family, and behavioural challenges, that attribute to low performance as well as a new curriculum and new standards which we handled as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The component with the greatest gap is the 4th grade ELA with a 17% gap. Comparing the entire state proficiency percentage with our school is not an accurate comparison. Many of our students are multiple grade levels behind in 4th grade and have made exceptional growth but are still working on being proficient on grade level.

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

There were two areas that either had minimal decline or a positive increase. 5th grade science achievement stayed relatively the same with only a 1% decline and 4th grade maths increased by 9% from the year before. Teachers pulled small groups during the instructional block, interventions during paws time and continuously worked on just in time support and raising the effectiveness of their instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance has been a concern for well over 3 years for EES. Following the new attendance protocol and getting teachers on board with calling and reaching out often will hopefully help to alleviate some of the attendance concerns.

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

3-5 ELA Proficiency
K-2 Foundational Skills to foster readers
Continuous improvement of core instruction
Interventions and Prevention

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA achievement data shows a decline in 3rd grade achievement over the last three years by 10%. The three year trend for 4th and 5th grade has shown a drop in student achievement followed by a very small percentage of growth. In 2021, student proficiency in 4th grade was at 46%. It then dropped by 9% in 2022, followed by a gain of 4% in 2023. In 2021, student proficiency in 5th grade was at 42%. It then dropped by 3% in 2022, followed by a gain of 2% in 2023.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In third grade, we will increase proficiency from 38% in ELA to 41%. In 4th grade, we will increase proficiency from 41% to 44% and in 5th grade we will increase proficiency from 41% to 44%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

In order to monitor the student growth in ELA we will:
-Focus on the identification of essential standards through professional learning, grade level planning, and classroom walk throughs.
-We will focus on utilizing common assessments within the curriculum to drive instruction and intervention.
-We will utilize a walk to intervention model for our students in the lowest 25th percentile and students in the Tier 3 of MTSS.
-Instructional coaches and intervention support will track student progress and work with students who need additional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In order to successfully increase our ELA student achievement, we will focus on the critical question, "What do we want our students to learn?" To do this, we will focus on creating common formative assessments that align to the essential standards. We will continue to implement the district instructional framework, with focus on both independent learning and collaboration. Teachers will continue to set the purpose for each lesson and model the desired outcomes. Grade level teams will engage in collaborative planning each week to determine what common formative assessments will be utilized and how they will adapt their instruction based on the results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing on identifying what we want our students to learn, we are creating clarity for student learning targets and identifying what the students need to meet proficiency. Through the creation of common formative assessments, we are able to determine what benchmarks the students are struggling with, in order to provide them with the additional support that they need to become proficient.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The leadership team will join weekly grade level planning sessions to help teachers identify which standards are essential and help to determine how to best assess the mastery of the standards.

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

By When: Weekly through May 2024

Professional learning on unpacking the standards in order to help teachers have a better understanding of what proficiency looks like.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Broadway (broadways@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 13, 2023

Classroom walk-throughs

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

By When: Weekly through May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
[no one identified]
Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence
Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No
Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The leadership team will attend the PLC conference on Teams in July. This will help the team to identify what a strong working team needs to be in order to successfully collaborate. Those in attendance will set structures in place in effort to lead our grade level teams to success during their CLT.

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

By When: July 2023

The math instructional coach and math teachers will determine which standards are considered essential.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lawson (lawsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Professional learning on unpacking the standards in order to help teachers have a better understanding of what proficiency looks like.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lawson (lawsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 13, 2023

The leadership team will join weekly grade level planning sessions to help teachers identify which standards in the current unit are essential and help to determine how to best assess the mastery of the standards.

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

By When: On-going throughout the year

Students will be pulled in a small group setting to work on the weaker standards that our specific to their education. This will occur daily during our intervention block.

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

By When: Daily

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Year over year are students with disabilities overall, are not performing at the desired level.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Eustis Elementary plans to increase our student achievement for our students with disabilities by 10% in 2024.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be monitored through our essential standards tracker and by their test scores during the progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

One of the interventions being used for our SWD's is tutoring specifically dedicated to their needs. we will also pull these students into small group intervention with a highly effective instructor based on their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Often times, SWD's are left out of the tutoring lists because they "already receive services." Students with disabilities often need more time to master concepts or more time with a highly effective teacher to make connections to concepts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The data that supports this focus on our ELL students is that data that shows they are underperforming year over year. To create a positive culture and environment for our ELL students and families, Eustis Elementary offers several resources. We currently have a Parent Resource Center with academic materials to support learning and language acquisition. All written communication with our families can be offered in English and Spanish. Our many after school events can also provide invitations in Spanish as well as a translators at the events. Our translators are also on campus every day to assist the teachers, students, and families.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

According to our data, 10% of our ELL students are English language proficient. During this school year, we will track our i-ready ELA scores to improve this ELP goal by 10%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Our data will be monitored by our Reading and Math coaches and administration for the first time in August. It will again be tracked in January to see the desired growth. We will also track the use of Rosetta stone to make sure it is used at least 4 times a week for 20 min per day.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerri White (whitek@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All students will receive ELL support through their teachers and classroom curriculum. ELL strategies will be provided by the classroom teachers and ELL paraprofessional. Students in 4th and 5th grade will be monitored on Rosetta Stone and i-ready. All students will complete daily i-ready lessons and progress through the lessons based on accuracy of 67% or higher. Students will be retaught and retested on standards with a score of less than 67%. Grades 2-5 will also be using Rosetta stone 4 days a week for 20 min a day and receive instruction on how to use word to word dictionaries and academic glossaries.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy has been selected because of it's trackability and correlation to the FAST test results. Teachers, coaches, and ELL providers have access to the student scores and can monitor the progress on a daily or weekly basis.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our EWS attendance data each month shows a continued need to get kids to school everyday. One of the ways to do that is make learning engaging and the environment of school fun and exciting with events, strong engaging instruction and relationships.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our plan is to stay on top of attendance throughout the year and decrease the amount of absences each month. We would like to have attendance in the green or above 95% for at least 50% of the school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Each week the leadership team will look at chronically absent students and make a plan to contact parents and intervene. We will also elicit the help of our school social work if we have difficult cases.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerri White (whitek@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Frequent and ongoing communication and intervention for students who are absent will in theory, increase their attendance. If our social worker also intervenes, that helps parents understand the severity of the attendance issue.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Frequent and ongoing communication builds relationships with families and allows us to pinpoint why the attendance issue is happening in the first place which allows us to offer resources where we can.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

-"Zones of Regulation" posters will be displayed in classrooms and common areas throughout the campus.
-Administration and the leadership team will conduct learning walks on a weekly basis.
-Guidance Counselor and the Mental Health Liaison will do lessons to support the "Zones of Regulation".
-Teachers and Staff will encourage students to refer to the "Zones of Regulation" cards and posters to help "self"-regulate their emotions.

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

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year (8/10/23-5/25/24).

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

At the end of each year the Principal sends out a survey to faculty and staff to elicit feedback on all areas of the organization as a whole including funding and what we spent it on, including feedback for what they feel it should be spent on the following year. The leadership team takes this data and makes school based decisions utilizing staff and teacher feedback. Funding sources discussed are SIP, SAI, SAC, Title 1 etc. This year in conjunction with looking at the feedback we are using more money through SAI funds and Title 1 funds to initiate more tutoring opportunities with highly effective teachers, for more students.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the 2022-2023 end of the year iReady Diagnostic assessment, kindergarten students scored 28% below proficiency, first grade students scored 68% below proficiency, and second grade students scored 71% below proficiency.

After reviewing the data, the area that we will address as a critical need in our K-2 classrooms will be phonics. In the area of phonics, 55% of kindergarteners, 76% of first graders, and 55% of second graders scored below proficiency. Teachers and interventionists will use both modeling and guided practice within the Fundations program to increase student proficiency in phonics.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

According to the 2023 PM3 FAST data, 62% of third graders, 59% of fourth graders, and 59% of fifth graders scored below the level 3 proficiency goal.

After reviewing the data, the area that we will address as a critical need in our 3-5 classrooms will be comprehension of both literary and informational text. The mid year iReady diagnostic showed that third graders were 58% below proficiency in comprehending literary text and 59% below proficiency in comprehending informational text. In fourth grade, 57% of students were below proficiency in comprehending literary text and 63% were below proficiency in comprehending informational text. In fifth grade, 62% were below proficiency in comprehending literary text and 65% were below proficiency in comprehending informational text.

Teachers and interventionists will use common formative assessment (CFA) data to measure student proficiency of the essential standards in regards to comprehension. Intervention groups will be created based on student needs as determined by the CFA data.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The 2022-2023 iReady end of year diagnostic data shows that 45% of kindergarten students, 24% of first grade students, and 45% of second grade students were proficient in phonics. Our goal is to increase each grade level's phonics proficiency by 5%; 50%, 29%, and 50% respectively.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The 2022-2023 iReady diagnostic data shows:
-3rd grade: 42% literary and 41% informational text proficiency
-4th grade: 43% literary and 37% informational text proficiency
-5th grade: 38% literary and 35% informational text proficiency

Our goal is to increase each domain proficiency score by 5%.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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

-Classroom learning walks (Leadership will walk classrooms for frequent observations and teachers will walk classrooms in the grade levels above and below to observe best practices several times during the school year.)
-Leadership team debrief meetings including next steps with an assigned team member
-Monitor iReady beginning of the year and mid-year data
-FAST/ STAR Progress Monitoring Assessments

-Use of grade level common assessments to drive instruction/ small groups

Teachers and leadership team members will continuously monitor the relevant data on student achievement for each goal and evaluate the impact at the end of the year by reviewing the effectiveness of the strategies listed above.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boardway, Reanna, boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

All K-5 teachers will use standards aligned materials adopted by the county: Wit and Wisdom. K-5 teachers will use common formative assessments to help guide instruction. Teachers and intervention support will pull small instructional groups based on the needs identified in the common formative assessments.

The Fundations program will be utilized with all of our students in grades K-3 to support phonics and phonemic awareness, along with Geodes in grades K-2. The iReady Magnetic Reading materials will be used with our learners in grades 2-5 who need additional support with comprehension.

School-wide, we will utilize iReady instructional minutes as a Tier 2 intervention and Tier 3 MTSS students will be pulled to work in small groups 3 times per week with a content area expert (math coach, literacy coach, reading intervention teacher).

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Fundations program is an evidence-based program that is designed to offer systematic instruction in phonics. The iReady Magnetic Reading Program is another evidence-based program that we will use, and is based on the Science of Reading. This program will address comprehension for both literary and informational text. The use of common formative assessments will assist teachers in determining student comprehension needs based on the essential standards.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All ELA teachers will participate in weekly professional learning teams to identify student needs based on common formative assessment data and classroom observations.	Boardway, Reanna, boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us
Provide small group support to students, model lessons, and hold professional development sessions to support the needs of teachers.	Broadway, Suzanne, broadways@lake.k12.fl.us
Hold quarterly data chats with all team members regarding the growth that students are making on both progress monitoring assessments and common formative assessments.	Boardway, Reanna, boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Copies of the SIP and UniSIG budget will be disseminated to stakeholders via a link on the school's website and social media platforms. Copies will be placed in the front office, parent resource center, and disseminated during the Title I Annual meeting. To ensure goals are met, components of the SIP will be reviewed at monthly scheduled SAC meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will build positive relationships with families by ensuring the Parent Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available via the school website. We believe positive relationships and engaging

parents, families, and community stakeholders in the education process is essential to improved academic success for students. We will foster and support active parent and family engagement so that the school and parents work together as partners in educating children.

To build positive relationships we will schedule and provide timely notice of School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings. We will also use social media platforms to notify and invite families and other key stakeholders of school-wide events and activities. Information is shared via the following platforms: Eustis Elementary School website (www.eel.lake.k12.fl.us), Facebook, Twitter and Peachjar.

The school will utilize data at parent teacher conferences to discuss each child's assessment results, expectations, and goals for the school year. At our monthly school events such as Literacy Night, STEAM Night, Math Night, Curriculum Night, etc. parents will receive materials and modeling of activities that can be used in the home. At our Annual Title I Meeting, Title I programs will be explained to parents, including the rights of the parents to be involved. Finally, through the use of our School-Parent Compact we will outline how parents, students, and school staff will share the responsibility for improving student achievement. This document also describes how parents and teachers will communicate regarding student progress.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Eustis Elementary School plans to strengthen the academic program in the school by using Title I funding to secure an additional classroom teacher allocation as well as multiple teacher assistant hours to support student learning and meet student needs in order to increase academic achievement. Additionally, the school will purchase J & J BootCamp Science curriculum to enhance the instruction surrounding the Florida Standards for 5th grade science.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan is developed in coordination with parents, community partners, staff and students. To gather input, we will send an end of the year survey to parents, community partners, staff, and students. Stakeholders also give input during SAC meetings and parent events held at the school.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$4,109.96
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	5200	0061 - Eustis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,003.96
	5100	1930	0061 - Eustis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$3,106.00

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$4,109.96

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No