Lakeside Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lakeside Elementary School

2752 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://les.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Wolfe

Start Date for this Principal: 11/26/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Lakeside Elementary School

2752 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://les.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Lakeside's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lakeside Elementary School exists to prepare life -long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wolfe, Dawn	Principal	The department heads, guidance, ESE and administration at Lakeside Elementary work collaboratively with stakeholders to ensure students are receiving high levels of instruction. The leadership team meets monthly to discuss school wide initiatives and protocols.
Grybb, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Knotts, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	
Tracanna-Breault, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Jernigan, Kelly	Instructional Media	
Jewell, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Fowler, Christy	Assistant Principal	
Dotson, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Henley, Alayne	Teacher, K-12	
Hunt, Emily	Teacher, K-12	
Loveland, Christine	Teacher, ESE	
Travis, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	120	110	85	103	107	100	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	737
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	3	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	12	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
53

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	65%	57%	67%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	62%	58%	66%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	54%	53%	66%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	70%	63%	71%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	66%	62%	75%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	56%	51%	76%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	65%	53%	65%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	120 (0)	110 (0)	85 (0)	103 (0)	107 (0)	100 (0)	112 (0)	737 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 ()	3 ()	3 ()	1 ()	1 ()	2 ()	2 ()	18 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	12 (0)	19 (0)	21 (0)	56 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	70%	68%	2%	58%	12%
	2018	59%	68%	-9%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	64%	11%	58%	17%
	2018	68%	62%	6%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	55%	4%

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					
06	2019	68%	64%	4%	54%	14%	
	2018	68%	63%	5%	52%	16%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		9%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	71%	-2%	62%	7%	
	2018	56%	70%	-14%	62%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		13%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%	
	2018	71%	66%	5%	62%	9%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison		16%					
05	2019	67%	64%	3%	60%	7%	
	2018	63%	65%	-2%	61%	2%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					
06	2019	89%	70%	19%	55%	34%	
	2018	91%	68%	23%	52%	39%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison		26%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	63%	-5%	53%	5%	
	2018	60%	64%	-4%	55%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	58	45	45	74	70	13				
ELL	46			46	70						
ASN	82	50		82	90						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	57	61	31	60	62	53	31				
HSP	63	74	42	75	86	82	50				
MUL	80	81		93	94						
WHT	75	78	69	79	83	73	70				
FRL	64	72	56	74	81	76	58				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	34	29	41	67	64	17				
ELL	47	83		67	83						
BLK	46	44	50	57	77	73					
HSP	63	54	40	69	65	65	59				
MUL	70	45		70	71		70				
WHT	68	56	33	77	79	79	64				
FRL	57	50	39	66	73	74	59				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	29	51	53	42	68	72	20				
ELL	21	54		50	69						
BLK	47	51	50	61	80	78	54				
HSP	61	65	60	67	71	76	44				
MUL	84	71		80	81						
WHT	71	67	72	73	75	70	71				
FRL	59	63	65	63	74	80	57				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	550
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	87
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	69
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

School-wide data shows that the group that had the lowest performance percentage was our bottom 25% in the area of ELA. More specifically was the bottom 25% in 5th grade in the area of ELA. Our bottom quartile is mostly comprised of ESE students. The majority of these students based on local assessments (iReady data) were performing at one to two grade levels below their current grade.

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

School-wide data shows that the learning gains of the lowest quartile in Math was the greatest decline from the prior year going from 73% in 17-18 to 71% in 18-19. Teachers were not utilizing small groups for true differentiation nor were all teachers utilizing the same curriculum.

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.

School-wide data shows that all areas were above the state average. However, Science had the lowest difference between the school and the state.

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

School-wide data shows that the most improved area was in the learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA. In 17-18 this area had a 37% and in 18-19 it increased to 58%, showing an increase of 21%. Targeted differentiated small group instruction and monitoring of the lowest quartile students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

As of this point, we only have 2 out of 737 students showing 2 or more indicators. Those students are being tracked and monitored consistently. If more students arise with 2 or more indicators, they will also be tracked, monitored, and assisted through the Student Success Team meeting process.

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

1. Maintaining a high level of achievement from the previous year
2. Increase student achievement on the NGSSS Science assessment
3. Increase the learning gains for the bottom quartile in Math
4. Increase the learning gains for the bottom quartile in ELA
5. Parental Involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains Bottom Quartile
Rationale	This is still a continued area of weakness, in spite of the 21% increase (37% to 58%) from the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Lakeside Elementary will continue to make learning gains in the bottom quartile for ELA by achieving an increase to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The lowest quartile students have been identified and teachers are tracking and monitoring those students on a daily basis. Those students are receiving differentiated small group instruction with their teacher and the Title 1 Assistant assigned to that grade level. Students will use LAFS for whole group instruction. They will use Achieve 3000 and iReady to support classroom instruction. Bottom quartile students will also be the first students to receive an offer for after school tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	School-wide data and the bottom quartile report were used to identify those students and the area of opportunity for our school.
Action Step	
Description	1. Small-Group Instruction 2. Title 1 Assistants will be used to meet with small groups throughout all grades for targeted instruction. Priority is given to bottom quartile and level 1 students. 3. Monitoring Achieve 3000 and iReady Data 4. After School Tutoring Services
Person Responsible	Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains Bottom Quartile
Rationale	This is an area of opportunity, in spite of achieving 71% this was a decrease from the previous year of 73%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Lakeside Elementary will continue to make learning gains in the bottom quartile for Math by achieving an increase to 73%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The lowest quartile students have been identified and teachers are tracking and monitoring those students on a daily basis. Those students are receiving differentiated small group instruction with their teacher and the Title 1 Assistant assigned to that grade level. Students will utilize Eureka Math for whole group instruction and will also utilize iReady Math Toolbox for support. Bottom quartile students will also be the first students to receive an offer for after school tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	School-wide data and the bottom quartile report were used to identify those students and the area of opportunity for our school.

Action Step	
Description	1. Small-Group Instruction 2. Title 1 Assistants will be used to meet with small groups throughout all grades for targeted instruction. Priority is given to bottom quartile and level 1 students. 3. Monitoring iReady Data 4. After School Tutoring Services
Person Responsible	Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Lakeside Elementary is reinstating the PFA and has created a school committee devoted to Family and Community Engagement. The 2 committees will work together to create activities to build positive relationships with all stakeholders. Additionally, Lakeside has increased its use of Social Media, Robocalls, Positive Phone Calls Home, and flyers for events. We also have held and plan to hold a variety of informative and recreational events to increase positive relationships such as Open House, Eureka Math Night, Fall Family Fun Night, Evening Conferences, STEM is in the Air Evening, and much more.
The School Advisory Council will meet quarterly at a minimum. SAC and PFA will provide input at meetings for SIP, PFEP, Title 1 budget and Title 1 program via discussions and anonymous feedback forms.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Lakeside is staffed with 2 guidance counselors who are available to provide support for all students on an as-needed basis. They also provide social-emotional lessons within the classrooms. Additionally, we have the services of a school psychologist and social worker to aid in situations in which advice or help is needed.
The administration is providing professional development on classroom discipline and positive behavior supports to increase relationship building with the students. There will also be a professional development session to guide teachers on how to teach students who suffer from trauma-related incidents. We also have a military life counselor who frequently pulls small groups of students whose parents are active military.
The early warning system is monitored by one of of our guidance counselors and through our PBIS/ MTSS committee. Student success meetings will be held if the need arises to provide additional support to any student.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Lakeside utilizes staggered enrollment to help with the transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten. We offer a Kindergarten Parent Night before the first day of school. We offer Orientation for the whole school and we hold Open House, but divide it between 1st-3rd and 4th-6th grades. Lakeside also held its first annual New to Lakeside Popsicle party for students to get to know other students who were also new to Lakeside. Towards the end of the year, the JH comes to give information to the current 6th graders and explain the process for Junior High.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Lakeside used Title 1 funds to hire 3 new classroom assistants. Those assistants each have 2-grade levels for which they are responsible. Classroom teachers identify what students the classroom assistants will work with on a regular basis. We will use Title 1 Funding to hire substitutes so teachers are able to participate in in-depth data discussions with the administration.The early warning system is monitored by one of of our guidance counselors and through our PBIS/MTSS committee. Student

success meetings will be held if the need arises to provide additional support to any student. Administration pulls data after each diagnostic and growth monitoring check and then meets with teachers to discuss data. Teachers will identify students who are struggling and refer them to the PBIS/MTSS committee in order to discuss interventions and if necessary to begin the MTSS process.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Lakeside has business partners and plans to have a job fair for 6th grade.