Lake Shore Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Shore Middle School

2519 BAYVIEW RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/lakeshore

Demographics

Principal: Latasha Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Duval 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

Lake Shore Middle School

2519 BAYVIEW RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/lakeshore

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

The mission of Lake Shore Middle School is to meet the physical, social and emotional needs of both our students and staff, while providing a rigorous and purposeful academic environment where students develop ownership in their learning and are provided with the knowledge, skills, and experience to ensure success in all avenues of higher education and personal development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Shore Middle School strives to provide students and staff members with an environment and atmosphere that encourages inquiry, inspires creativity, promotes reflection, and establishes purpose as a foundation on which to build a thorough and well-rounded educational experience.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stuart, Scott	Principal	Use the school mission to develop a plan of action to guide and empower stakeholders through the process of bringing the school vision into reality. Oversight and accountability of operations and instruction.
Butler, Rhodeshia	Assistant Principal	
Happel, Seth	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/6/2020, Latasha Clark

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
61

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	0	0	0	0	0	405	358	319	0	0	0	0	1082
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	115	44	0	0	0	0	250
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	22	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	256	174	138	0	0	0	0	568
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	220	291	233	0	0	0	0	744

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	203	198	142	0	0	0	0	543

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	15	16	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	462	332	350	0	0	0	0	1144
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	41	25	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	143	138	0	0	0	0	428
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	9	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	217	261	0	0	0	0	724

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	201	183	207	0	0	0	0	591

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	381	514	244	0	0	0	0	1139
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	462	332	350	0	0	0	0	1144
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	41	25	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	143	138	0	0	0	0	428
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	9	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	217	261	0	0	0	0	724

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	201	183	207	0	0	0	0	591

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	381	514	244	0	0	0	0	1139
Students retained two or more times	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	34%	43%	54%	34%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	49%	54%	43%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	45%	47%	33%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	40%	49%	58%	39%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	50%	50%	57%	51%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	47%	51%	54%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	37%	44%	51%	36%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	68%	72%	50%	65%	70%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	24%	47%	-23%	54%	-30%
	2018	23%	44%	-21%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	26%	44%	-18%	52%	-26%
	2018	34%	41%	-7%	51%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	31%	49%	-18%	56%	-25%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	27%	51%	-24%	55%	-28%
	2018	25%	42%	-17%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	40%	47%	-7%	54%	-14%
	2018	35%	50%	-15%	54%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	21%	32%	-11%	46%	-25%
	2018	18%	31%	-13%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	23%	40%	-17%	48%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	14%	44%	-30%	50%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	67%	33%	67%	33%
2018	86%	63%	23%	65%	21%
Compare		14%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	69%	1%	71%	-1%
2018	98%	84%	14%	71%	27%
Compare		-28%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	57%	18%	61%	14%
2018	85%	61%	24%	62%	23%
Compare		-10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	36	48	34	40	53	45	37	54			
ELL	12	37	33	21	53	58	16	40			

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
ASN	50	59		69	59						
BLK	33	45	39	37	49	46	33	73	65		
HSP	22	45	40	33	54	50	41	67	80		
MUL	21	33		44	43		26	71			
WHT	45	52	39	51	51	58	52	70	73		
FRL	31	45	41	39	50	51	33	70	76		

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	30	40	35	35	47	49	44	61			
ELL	16	38	35	19	37	47	6				
ASN	54	58		63	42		58				
BLK	30	37	38	33	38	41	24	73	83		
HSP	40	42	29	42	49	52	38	83	88		
MUL	30	36		28	30	50					
WHT	48	49	40	54	55	32	60	85	88		
FRL	31	39	37	36	41	41	30	74	86		

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	11	30	24	19	38	38	32	32			
ELL	10	31	31	14	54	48		32			
ASN	56	39		64	70			70			
BLK	30	42	32	35	51	56	26	44	69		
HSP	34	36	28	36	53	43	38	58	70		
MUL	27	43	38	36	56	45	27	54			
WHT	46	49	39	48	47	54	59	58	63		
FRL	29	38	31	35	48	54	32	44	63		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	59
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Based on Prior Year's Data: ELA Achievement has been the lowest performing component over the last 2 years, falling 1% from 2018 to 2019. Based on reflection within the ELA Department, the most significant factor has been retention of experienced & effective teachers in the department.

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

Based on Prior Year's Data: A decline in Acceleration Points has been attribute to a drop in the Algebra 1 EOC performance scores. The primary factor was listed as an inability to schedule students into double blocked sections for this course.

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.

Based on Prior Year's Data: In comparison with the State Average, Lake Shore Middle School shows the most significant discrepancy in ELA Achievement, performing 20% lower than the State Average of 54% in 2019. As stated in Section A, the most significant factor has been retention of experienced & effective teachers in the department.

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

Based on Prior Year's Data: Math achievement and Math learning gains. By providing 90 minutes of instruction along with the instructional support of the Math coach students were able to receive the time and interaction with the materials & resources needed to show improvement in this area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on Prior Year's Data: The number of students absent from school. This attributes to the low performance in
class and on state assessments.

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

1. English Language Arts Achievement
2. Math Achievement
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA Lowest 25 Percentile
5. ESOL Student Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Administration in need of calibration based on Standard Based Instruction Continuum. Standard-Based Walk-Through data indicates a significant need for improvement in both frequency of walk-throughs and alignment of assessment to standard. Out of 170 documented SWT's in the 2019-20 School year, the majority show a lack of alignment when it comes to assessment. Additionally, when Teachers were asked if there is consistency in curriculum, instruction, and learning materials among teachers in the same grade level at this school, in the 5 Essentials Survey, results indicated a decrease (mScore of 57 to 47) in Program Coherence from 2019 to 2020.
Measurable Outcome:	Improvement in Program Coherence to a mean Score of at least 60 (Strong) on the 5 Essentials Survey for this school year. Increase number of SWT's from 170 in 2019-20 to over 600 for the 2020-21 School Year. Improve Standard-Alignment for Assessments to an average score of 3.5 or above for Assessing Student Learning in the SWT Dashboard System. Administrative Calibration will progress from Weak to Good/Strong by January 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the Standards Walk-through Tool and resulting data, Administration can measure level of alignment for teacher planning, instruction, student learning, student assessment and intervention/experiences in the academic environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators will conduct initial and monthly follow-up Calibration Walk-Throughs with reflection and dialogue to ensure all are in agreement on the definition of Standard-Alignment as it relates to each category in the SWT Dashboard Tool.

Person Responsible	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will schedule a minimum of 6 SWT's each week to ensure consistency and validity of observations and assessment of standard alignment.

Person Responsible	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

Strategic change in the master schedule to include common planning across departments will ensure opportunity for teachers to work in subject-area cohorts to develop standard-based assessments and conduct vertical planning with focus on preparing students for the inherent progression in standard-based instruction and assessment within each core subject.

Person Responsible	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

Review of SWT Data will be conducted by Administrators on a weekly basis to identify areas of need and determine next steps as it relates to the school as a whole, individual departments, and individual classrooms.

Person Responsible   Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

Instructional Coaches will provide support to teachers through PLC to develop and analyze results of standards-based assessments and to develop instruction to be driven by that data.

Person Responsible   Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

Development of a common template/matrix through collaborative planning in PLC to determine clear expectations for how standard-alignment will be ingrained in planning lessons, demonstrated and assessed.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Title I funds will be utilized to fund additional core subject area teachers to provide more specialized instruction to students through smaller class sizes.

Person Responsible   Rhodeshia Butler (butlerr1@duvalschools.org)

Title I will fund Acaletics. Supplemental Algebra materials to be used in remediation and more specialized instruction in Algebra.

Person Responsible   Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

Title I funds will be used to purchase laptops for students to use digital platforms relating to core subject areas.

Person Responsible   Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELL Students & Multi-Racial Students sub-groups have been identified as below 41% on the ESSA Federal Index and in need of strategic support in core academic subjects.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL Students will improve in Proficiency in Core Academic Subjects, specifically in ELA, moving from 12.1% to 20% on the State Assessment; Multi-Racial students will improve in ELA from 20.9% to match the overall school average of 34% on the State Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELL students scoring above a 3 on WIDA & Multi-Racial Students will be enrolled in Corrective Reading (SRA) to receive targeted instruction and strategic support to build literacy and reading fluency. ELL students scoring below 3 on WIDA will be scheduled into English Language Development & Sheltered English Classes to build both development and fluency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Corrective Reading (SRA) is a District Approved curriculum that applies Evidence-based strategies to reading instruction. Training/Professional Development and support with instruction and assessment are provided by the district to ensure proper and consistent implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

Students in the ELL who score below 3 on the WIDA will be scheduled into ELD & Sheltered ELA sections with a certified ESOL instructor. ELL scoring above a 3 on WIDA & Multi-Racial subgroups showing a deficit in fluency will be enrolled into Corrective Reading courses based on individual reading data.

Person Responsible	Rhodeshia Butler (butlerr1@duvalschools.org)

ESSA sub-groups will be monitored through Corrective Reading Curriculum Assessment as well as through Achieve 3000 Lexile and Standard-Based common assessments to assess growth/improvement.

Person Responsible	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

Title I funds will be utilized to fund an Art position to improve student achievement by creating a more academically rounded student and integrate other subject areas through art instruction.

Person Responsible	Rhodeshia Butler (butlerr1@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA Standard-Based Assessment is the lowest of the assessed subjects at the school and significantly lower than the district average. Scores in ELA have also dropped by 1% form 2018 to 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	Percent of students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA Standard-Based Assessment will improve from 34% to to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Combination of the following: Improved Standard-Alignment for instruction through use of Achievement Level Descriptors to build lesson that address the full standard; Use of FSA Item Specs to develop Standard-Aligned Common Assessments; Use of TOP SCORE Writing Curriculum; Use of Corrective Reading Curriculum
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Both Top Score & Corrective Reading curriculum have been purchased by the district and are provided with training, support, assessment, and resources; Use of Achievement Level Descriptors for FSA in building lessons ensures instruction, assignments, activities, etc. address the full standard. Use of Item Specs ensures assessments reflect the rigor/ complexity of the Standard-Based State Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategic scheduling to ensure common planning across core subject areas, including ELA, enables teachers to work closely with colleagues to develop standard-aligned instructional lessons and Standard-aligned assessments.

Person Responsible	Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

Administrators, Reading Coach, and all Reading Instructors will participate in Professional Development Training for Corrective Reading to ensure all teachers and support staff have a clear and common expectations regarding instructional delivery, assessment, and interventions.

Person Responsible	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

Use Title 1 funds to pay for reading coach position

Person Responsible	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Culture & Environment has been identified as an area in need of significant improvement both through analysis of Discipline Data and more explicitly through the responses from Teachers, Students, and Parents on the 5 Essentials Survey, identifying school climate & teacher support as one of the most prominent needs.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduction of Discipline Data, specifically reducing number of Class 2 Referrals by 30% and SESIR Incidents by 50%. Increase in overall ratings on the 5 Essentials Survey in areas of Supportive Environment by at least 10% points for students and Increase in area of Teacher Collaboration by at least 20 %.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Stuart (stuarts1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies to support improvement in student behavior.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of PBIS incorporates multiple tiers of support and addresses multiple areas in need of improvement through one major collaborative system of support.

Action Steps to Implement

Title I funds will be used to fund a Dean to provide additional support to our classroom teachers and students to improve student engagement thereby improving student achievement.

Person Responsible	Rhodeshia Butler (butlerr1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Listed Above

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

By empowering our PBIS team to take ownership of Positive Behavior Interventions at the school level and increasing stakeholder participation in the PTSA & School Advisory Committee and our new Partners With Purpose program, Lake shore will reach out to stakeholders for support in efforts to continue improvements in the school and community by rewarding student success, incentivizing hard work and determination, celebrating faculty and demonstrating the community support we know is major factor in any school's success. By building community business/organization and stakeholder participation, we hope to better define the connection between school and community and demonstrate how significant the lessons and experiences are to the successes they will achieve once outside these walls.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00