

Duval County Public Schools

# Lake Shore Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>22</b> |

# 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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (48%)<br>2016-17: C (45%)<br>2015-16: D (40%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  | N/A  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | N/A  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

# Lake Shore Middle School

2519 BAYVIEW RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

<http://www.duvalschools.org/lakeshore>

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2019-20 Title I School</b> | <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Middle School<br>6-8                                    | Yes                           | 100%  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 81%   |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | 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**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (48%)<br>2016-17: C (45%)<br>2015-16: D (40%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  | N/A  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | N/A  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

**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  | 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  | 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  | 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%   |

| <b>EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey</b> |  |          |          |              |
|--|--|----------|----------|--------------|
| <b>Indicator</b>                                     | <b>Grade Level (prior year reported)</b> |          |          | <b>Total</b> |
|  | <b>6</b>                                 | <b>7</b> | <b>8</b> |              |
|  | (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.**

| <b>ELA</b>            |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 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%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 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%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b> |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>   | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 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   |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested   | 98% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>   |     |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| 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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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** Rhodessia 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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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 (stuart1@duvalschools.org)

Use Title 1 funds to pay for reading coach position

**Person Responsible** Scott Stuart (stuart1@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 (stuart1@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        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |