

Escambia County School District

Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center

129 N MERRITT ST, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Sarah LEEANNE GUY

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Escambia County School Board on 8/30/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center

129 N MERRITT ST, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

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)
Combination School KG-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Escambia County School Board on 8/30/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Lakeview School Day Support (SDS) we believe all children have the ability to be successful academically and behaviorally. SDS is committed to providing a therapeutic day school program to address the individual needs of students experiencing significant behavioral and mental health concerns. It is the goal of SDS to help students develop the skills necessary to transition into less restrictive educational settings.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Lakeview School Day Support, we believe that all children have the capacity to achieve success and make progress toward their individual goals. School Day Support will strive to provide the structure and positive supports needed to enable students to realize their potential, maximize their success and reach their goals.

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
Kirkland, Tammie	Other	Tammie handles all day to day operations of Lakeview SDS. This includes transportation, coordination of food services with the satellite provider, IEP coordination, scheduling, faculty and staff sign in and coverage in the event of absences, student discipline issues, testing coordination, technology, facility work orders, safety and security, first line of parent contact, textbooks, supervision of grades, lesson plans and every other daily Administrative duty of a school.
Tammie is the on site leader/ administrator. She facilitates day to day operations. She oversees buses, lunches, scheduling, curriculum, IEPs, field trips and all other administrative duties typically handled by an AP and CC.		
Perry, Donna	Principal	Donna is a District Administrator over Emotional/ Behavioral Disabilities who also serves as the Administrator/ supervisor of Lakeview SDS. Donna oversees all SDS operations, hiring, evaluations, student services, IEPs, FBA/PBIPs, contract negotiations with LCI, and parent involvement.
Storniolo, Marcia	Other	Marcia is a Board Certified Behavior Analyst. She trains staff on applied behavior analysis techniques, safety care, ukeru, FBA/ PBIP development, and directly supports students in the school. She leads the schools PBIS initiatives as well and serves as an integral part of the leadership team.
Hagan, Tara	Teacher, ESE	Tara is a classroom teacher of students in 3rd grade.
Gillard, Vivian	Teacher, K-12	Vivian teaches math 5-12, social/ emotional skills 7/8.

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	0	1	4	3	3	6	6	3	2	2	3	0	4	37
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	3	0	3	4	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	2	4	2	3	1	1	1	0	3	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	2	1	1	0	0	2	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	7

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	1	2	0	2	6	4	3	1	1	1	0	1	22

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	0
One or more suspensions	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
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	0%	64%	61%	0%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	51%	59%	0%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	54%	0%	9%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	65%	62%	0%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	47%	59%	0%	35%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	71%	56%	0%	70%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	69%	78%	0%	84%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	37 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	1 ()	3 ()	0 ()	3 ()	4 ()	4 ()	2 ()	1 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	19 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	23 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	18 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	7 (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	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	42%	-42%	54%	-54%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	43%	-43%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	58%	-58%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	36%	-36%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	36%	-36%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	21%	-21%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	24%	-24%	45%	-45%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	42%	-42%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	58%	-58%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	51%	-51%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	51%	-51%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	47%	-47%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	21	23		6	15						
FRL	21			9							
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	16
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	65
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	15
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Lakeview SDS student's showed the lowest performance in math when compared to the state. Contributing factors include decreased engagement in rigorous learning due to crisis level behavioral and mental health needs, low tolerance for frustration, lack of self regulation skills, and a decreased ability to meet educational demands.

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

Student math scores were again the component that showed the greatest decline from 17/18. Math requires a great deal of focus and mental energy. Research shows that when individuals are in heightened states of stress, they are not able to access the more complex areas of the brain needed for these processes.

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 shows gaps in student math scores when compared to the state average. 27% of the State SWD were proficient in math, and only 5% of SWD at Lakeview were proficient in math. However, Lakeview is a Center School for students with disabilities who are in the most severe states of behavioral and mental health crisis. When they are stable they return to traditional schools.

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

ELA showed the most improvement from 17/18 5% proficient to 15.8% proficient. Our teachers continued to use a wide variety of intensive supports for students. The very small group setting provides the opportunity to maximize teaching opportunities when students are stable and ready to learn.

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

Attendance & Course Failure

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

1. We will see a 10% or greater improvement in student attendance (at least 90%)
2. Decrease use of restraint and seclusion by 5%

- 3. Improve math proficiency by 5%
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Improve the number of SWD scoring proficient in math

Rationale Improving students' proficiency in math will enhance their ability to successfully transition to less restrictive educational settings and pursue standard high school diplomas and post secondary education and careers.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Students with disability scoring proficient in math will increase by 5% during the 19/20 school year at Lakeview SDS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy Accelerated Math

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy The math teachers at Lakeview shared that the Accelerated Math program is an evidenced based program that is proven to support student achievement.

Action Step

Description

1. Contact the Math department for assistance in obtaining accelerated math products and training
2. Secured necessary accelerated math PD
3. Implement accelerated math
4. Conduct regular SIP data meetings to review math data
- 5.

Person Responsible Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

#2	
Title	Improve student attendance
Rationale	Student attendance is critical to student success. Research shows that students with critically low attendance are more likely to drop out and have higher rates of risky behaviors.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 19/20 school year 52% of students with disabilities will maintain 90% or better attendance rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdf.l.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Restorative Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By implementing Restorative Practices students will build strong relationships with their school community and learn to take responsibility for their actions including school attendance. This will directly impact increased learning time and increased achievement as well.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Select next step Restorative Practice PD 2. Implement Restorative Practice PD 3. Make daily phone calls to absent students to check their behavioral/ mental health 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdf.l.us)

#3	
Title	Reduce the use of Restraint & Seclusion
Rationale	The use of Restraint & Seclusion for students with disabilities is limited to the most extreme situations when imminent danger is present and other less restrictive interventions have failed. However, research shows that their use has a negative effect on the relationship between the student and adult.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 19/20 school year, the use of restraint and seclusion for students with disabilities will reduce by 5% compared to 18/19.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Restorative Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By implementing Restorative Practices students will build strong healthy relationships with their teachers, IBAs, therapists and other staff. These strengthened relationships will help them be able to process difficult emotions that they experience when feeling frustrated so they can use safer problem solving methods. These methods will reduce violent behaviors and as a result reduce the need for restraint and seclusion.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weekly monitoring of Lakeview's restraint & seclusion data 2. Continued participation in Restorative Practice Professional Development 3. Debrief every incident of restraint or seclusion with all involved staff 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

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).

NA

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.

Lakeview SDS plans to host a parent night to engage parents in activities to help them become more involved in their child's education and mental health.

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.

Each student at Lakeview SDS has a Behavior Intervention Plan that is developed for them after a Functional Behavior Assessment is conducted. This plan targets a minimum of one behavior for each student for individualized, intensive intervention. Additionally each student participates in weekly individual counseling and weekly group counseling, daily social skills lessons, and therapeutic treatment embedded in the school day.

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

Students are referred to Lakeview SDS from their neighborhood schools when they are in emotional or behavioral crisis. An IEP is developed to address the individual needs of the student. Additionally the mental health counselor writes a treatment plan with the family. When treatment goals are met and IEP goals are met, the IEP committee meets to develop a transition plan for the student. This plan helps the student move to a less restrictive setting in either a cluster site or their neighborhood school based on student needs and the decisions made by the IEP team.

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.

This is the first year Lakeview SDS will be a Title 1 school under the current Administration. The available resources will be used to supplement curriculum with STAR 360, iready, and accelerated math. Additional funds will be used for Professional Development for staff in Restorative Practices. Materials will be inventoried by the Teacher in Charge. A Parent Family Engagement Plan will also be developed and implemented.

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

Lakeview SDS is committed to exploring business partnerships. Students engage in college and career awareness activities in their Career Awareness classes and teachers have plans during the 19/20 school year for Community Based Instruction centered around Career Awareness. The Adapted Physical Education teacher is bringing community programs to Lakeview SDS this year to help students learn more about safety, leisure activities, and the support for their behavioral health activity offers.