

Lake County Schools

Eustis Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Eustis Middle School

18725 BATES AVE, Eustis, FL 32736

<https://ems.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.

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, 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
Spencer, Michael	Principal	Serves as the primary instructional leader of the school, who creates and implements the instructional plan that addresses the needs of our diverse student population while promoting student achievement for all subgroups. Mr. Spencer oversees all content areas, participates in collaborative teacher planning time, and also supervises every operation of our school from safety and security to food services. Mr. Spencer also serves as the "face" of our school by forming strong alliances within local business and community circles.
Durias, Herman	Assistant Principal	Responsible for helping carry out the instructional mandates that originate with the principal. He is directly responsible for supervising Social Studies directly to the principal regarding instructional practices and student learning in the aforementioned department, including participates in collaborative teacher planning time. Mr. Durias is also directly responsible for school safety on Eustis Middle School's campus.
Harden, Becky	Assistant Principal	Responsible for helping carry out the instructional mandates that originate with the principal. She is directly responsible for supervising Math and Science Reports directly to the principal regarding instructional practices and student learning in the three aforementioned departments, participates in collaborative teacher planning time. She also is over the guidance department. Ms. Harden has additional responsibilities in overseeing the master schedule, Title 1, and testing on campus. She reports to the principal in these areas.
Cassidy, Whitney	Reading Coach	Coaching ELA and Reading teachers, providing new teacher support, participates in collaborative teacher planning time and supporting campus-wide testing at our school.
Keesee, Tiffany	Administrative Support	Working closely with our lower quartile math and ELA students, overseeing MTSS and interventions, and taking the lead on school-wide testing at EMS.
Waite, Randolph	Dean	Provides academic coaching to teachers, participates in collaborative teacher planning time, and handles student discipline.

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.

Our school Leadership Team met at the end of the 2022-2023 school year and at the beginning of the 2023-2024 school year to review stakeholder input to develop the 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan for Eustis Middle School. We have solicited stakeholder input at parent family engagement events and our School Advisory Council meetings. We have also used the feedback from our stakeholder surveys

from students, staff, and parents to develop our School Improvement Plan. Our Leadership Team and Guiding Coalition Team gathered staff input during department meetings to create our school improvement plan goals for the 2023-2024 school year.

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 School Improvement Plan will be monitored weekly by our Leadership Team as well as monthly by our Guiding Coalition Team. We will review and analyze assessment data from our district and state academic assessment results. We will also monitor discipline data. Students who suffer from achievement gaps or receive excessive disciplinary infractions will be referred to our MTSS team for additional supports and intervention.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	116	135	356	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	42	40	92	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	69	114	278	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	56	66	230	
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		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	142	172	477	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	

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	0	0	0	0	0	96	101	130	327
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	20	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	44	56	159
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	86	92	268
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	0	0	0	0	139	151	212	502

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	29	32	92

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	0	0	0	0	0	96	101	130	327
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	20	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	44	56	159
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	86	92	268
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	0	0	0	0	139	151	212	502

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	29	32	92

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*	41	43	49	40	45	50	40		
ELA Learning Gains				38			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28			37		
Math Achievement*	51	52	56	48	33	36	45		
Math Learning Gains				52			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			32		
Science Achievement*	35	42	49	33	50	53	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	64	68	58	54	58	59		
Middle School Acceleration	72	70	73	82	45	49	79		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					67	70			
ELP Progress	41	44	40	63	71	76	72		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	302
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
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	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	4	4
ELL	22	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	48			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	58			

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%
FRL	45			

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	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	44			

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	41			51			35	62	72			41
SWD	19			20			14	26			4	
ELL	16			18			0	36			5	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			35			29	54	62		5	
HSP	36			50			26	61	73		6	41
MUL	47			49			38	79	60		5	

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
PAC												
WHT	47			58			42	65	76		5	
FRL	36			41			25	57	68		6	41

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	40	38	28	48	52	46	33	58	82			63
SWD	18	26	16	22	39	36	20	23	80			
ELL	22	27	19	30	44	45	20	38	82			63
AMI												
ASN	80	50		90	90							
BLK	23	35	33	31	46	44	19	48	79			
HSP	38	34	27	48	54	48	27	53	82			63
MUL	33	36	8	52	60	46	31	57	77			
PAC												
WHT	50	41	28	56	52	49	44	66	83			
FRL	33	33	27	40	48	41	23	48	79			64

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	40	41	37	45	46	32	40	59	79			72
SWD	17	28	29	18	30	33	14	33	62			
ELL	25	41	46	30	36	21	13	52				72
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	26	22	26	32	25	30	44	69			
HSP	40	42	46	41	43	24	30	65	80			71
MUL	32	45		30	36	50	50	50	67			
PAC												
WHT	49	47	42	59	57	47	48	64	82			
FRL	32	35	37	37	42	33	34	53	77			76

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
07	2023 - Spring	34%	43%	-9%	47%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	35%	46%	-11%	47%	-12%
06	2023 - Spring	40%	46%	-6%	47%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	48%	55%	-7%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	27%	47%	-20%	48%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	55%	56%	-1%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	44%	-11%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	51%	45%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	67%	-7%	66%	-6%

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 component with our lowest performance was our 7th Grade Math Achievement. We restructured our advanced math courses, so that our advanced 6th and 7th grade students took the 8th grade math PM 3 test. This led to an increase in 8th Grade Math Achievement scores, but a decrease in 7th Grade Math Achievement. We have one new 7th grade math teacher that we will be providing support and coaching to ensure her own success and to ensure that her students are successful as well.

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

The data component with our greatest decline from the prior year was our 7th Grade Math Achievement. We restructured our advanced math courses, so that our advanced 6th and 7th grade students took the 8th grade math PM 3 test. This led to an increase in 8th Grade Math Achievement scores, but a decrease in 7th Grade Math Achievement.

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

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was our 7th Grade Math Achievement. We restructured our advanced math courses, so that our advanced 6th and 7th grade students took the 8th grade math PM 3 test. This led to an increase in 8th Grade Math Achievement scores, but a decrease in 7th Grade Math Achievement. We have one new 7th grade math teacher that we will be providing support and coaching to ensure the teacher's own success and to ensure that her students are successful as well.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our 8th Grade Math Achievement which increased 20% from the year prior. We restructured our advanced math courses, so that our advanced 6th and 7th grade students took the 8th grade math PM 3 test. This led to an increase in 8th Grade Math Achievement scores. Our 8th grade math teachers collaborated weekly which also contributed to this improvement.

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

An area of concern we have is that in our incoming 6th grade cohort, we have 95 students who scored a Level 1 on the ELA PM 3 test and 108 students who scored a Level 1 on the Math PM 3 test. We will

need to work diligently to meet the needs of these students and work to get their learning back on grade level.

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

Our top priority for this upcoming school year is to increase the learning gains of our Lowest 25% ELA students as well as our Lowest 25% Math students. Our next priority is to increase our 7th Grade Math Achievement scores. Our 3rd priority is to decrease the amount of students who have been suspended one or more times during the school year.

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 Collaborative Planning

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.

According to our school data from last school year, our achievement levels dropped in 6th Grade ELA, 8th Grade ELA, and 7th Grade Math. Our plan is to improve achievement through teacher collaboration. Our teachers will meet weekly with their grade level subject area teams. They will identify essential standards, create and analyze common formative assessments, and use this data to determine appropriate interventions to reteach content that was not initially learned.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to see a 10% increase from the FAST PM 1 test to the FAST PM 3 test in 6th Grade ELA, 8th Grade ELA, and 7th Grade Math.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor improvements in 6th Grade ELA, 8th Grade ELA, and 7th Grade Math by monitoring and analyzing common formative assessment data, end of unit assessment data, and data for the FAST PM 1 and FAST PM 2 assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Spencer (spencerm@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.)

If a team of teachers fails to show growth, our administration will provide targeted feedback and model how an effective team meeting is done during their collaborative professional learning team meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our administration is committed to seeing improvements in our subject areas that did not improve from the previous year's assessments. We believe that through feedback and collaboration, we can collectively improve the instructional practices of our teachers and develop intervention strategies to meet the needs of all of our students.

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

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

An area of focus for us for this school year is the learning gains of our lowest 25% students in the 6th grade. In our current 6th grade cohort, we have 95 students who scored a Level 1 on the ELA PM 3 test last year and 108 students who scored a Level 1 on the Math PM 3 test last year. We plan to use our daily intervention block to provide remediation to our lower quartile students and provide intensive support in the areas they need help in the most.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to see a 10% increase from the FAST PM 1 test to the FAST PM 3 test in 6th Grade ELA and 6th Grade Math amongst our lower quartile students.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor improvements in 6th Grade ELA and 6th Grade Math, amongst our lower quartile students, by monitoring and analyzing common formative assessment data, end of unit assessment data, and data for the FAST PM 1 and FAST PM 2 assessments. We will also monitor the grades and failure rates of our lower quartile students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Becky Harden (hardenb@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.)

Our teachers will monitor and analyze common formative assessment data by standard and use this data to schedule our lower quartile students into their intervention block courses in order to provide them small group remediation based on their need. We will look at needs by student, by standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We offer a 30 minute intervention block each day to our students. This is built in time during the school day that our teachers will utilize to reteach low performing standards to our lower quartile students and help them make improvements and move their learning to on grade level proficiency.

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

#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.

We have seen the Federal Index for our students with disabilities (SWD) fall below 32% for the 3 consecutive years. Improving the proficiency of our SWD students is a priority of ours. We plan to meet their needs through targeted intervention and small group reteaching.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to improve the Federal Index for our SWD students 10%. We want to improve from 32% to 42% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor improvements in our SWD students by monitoring and analyzing grades, common formative assessment data, end of unit assessment data, and data for the FAST PM 1 and FAST PM 2 assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Herman Durias (duriash@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.)

We will provide small group targeted intervention to our SWD students to provide them with the extra help they need to be successful. We will provide a Learning Strategies class to our SWD students for extra support. Our support teachers will push into classrooms and pull-out students to work in small groups. We will also offer targeted small group intervention for our SWD students during our intervention block.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe our SWD students will succeed better in small settings with less students. This will allow our teachers to give them more 1-on-1 assistance and spend more time on meeting each of their individual needs.

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

#4. 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.

We currently have 92 students that were suspended one day or more last school year. We plan to establish school-wide academic and behavioral norms that will provide clear guidance and expectations to our teachers and students about how to be successful at Eustis Middle School.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to decrease the amount of students that were suspended one day or more to 70 or less for this school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor student discipline data quarterly to watch for behavioral trends with our students. Our leadership team will discuss and create strategies to form positive relationships with our students and decrease discipline infractions and suspensions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Spencer (spencerm@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.)

Students with multiple discipline infractions will be assigned a mentor. Their mentor will check in with them frequently to discuss grades, discipline, and form positive relationships with them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that if every student, who struggles behaviorally, is assigned a mentor, it will help decrease the number of discipline infractions for that student. By showing our students that we are invested and that we care, we believe they will be less likely to commit disciplinary infractions and be more invested in our school.

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

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)).

Our school improvement funding allocations are created based on stakeholder input. Our Title 1 budget is created, reviewed, and approved by our School Advisory Council each year. Part of our Title 1 budget is used to pay for additional staff allocations. We use this allocations to provide intensive support and meet the needs of our students. We also use these funds to pay before tutoring opportunities to help remediate our students who need help the most. We also use these funds to pay for teacher writing teams and professional development geared towards helping our staff prepare high-quality lessons for our students and improve their professional practice. Our SAI budget is created and approved by our school leadership team. We use these funds to pay for tutoring opportunities, teacher writing teams, and educational software. All of these expenses will be used to benefit our students who need academic help the most.

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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