# Lake Asbury Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Lake Asbury Elementary School

### 2901 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

### http://lae.oneclay.net

## Demographics

## Principal: Heather Roche
Start Date for this Principal: 10/4/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-6 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 42% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (59%)<br><br>2017-18: B (60%)<br><br>2016-17: C (52%)<br><br>2015-16: B (56%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Cassandra Brusca |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## 2901 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

## http://lae.oneclay.net

### School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-6 | No | 36% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 25% |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Our mission is to increase the academic achievement of all students. Lake Asbury Elementary, working collaboratively with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Our teachers will provide rigorous and relevant learning opportunities for each child to experience academic success within a safe and inviting environment.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Lake Asbury Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for personal success in a global and a diverse society.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Outman, Tiffany | Principal | Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and insure proper security, maintenance and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including: interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc.. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, Title I, Dropout Prevention, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Standards Assessments, End-of-Course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students and community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position. |
| McIver, Melanie | Assistant Principal | Maintain facilities and monitor student progress. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Love, Angela | Teacher, K-12 | Facilitate student learning and monitor student progress. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 10/4/2020, Heather Roche

**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.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

41

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-6 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 42% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%) |

| | 2015-16: B (56%) |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Cassandra Brusca](#) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). | |

## 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 | 96 | 82 | 118 | 91 | 109 | 140 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 766 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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**

Sunday 10/4/2020

## 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 | 80 | 116 | 108 | 106 | 137 | 139 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 832 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 80 | 116 | 108 | 106 | 137 | 139 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 832 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 64% | 65% | 57% | 65% | 62% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | 62% | 58% | 57% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 54% | 53% | 33% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 71% | 70% | 63% | 65% | 64% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 63% | 66% | 62% | 57% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | 56% | 51% | 35% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 68% | 65% | 53% | 50% | 55% | 51% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 73% | 68% | 5% | 58% | 15% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 68% | -4% | 57% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 58% | 64% | -6% | 58% | 0% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| | 2018 | 59% | 62% | -3% | 56% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -1% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | -6% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 66% | 62% | 4% | 56% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 59% | -11% | 55% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | 18% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | 7% | | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 58% | 64% | -6% | 54% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 63% | 1% | 52% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -6% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | 10% | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 76% | 71% | 5% | 62% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 70% | 6% | 62% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | 0% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 78% | 69% | 9% | 64% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 77% | 66% | 11% | 62% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | 1% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | 2% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 61% | 64% | -3% | 60% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 65% | -4% | 61% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | 0% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | -16% | | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 65% | 70% | -5% | 55% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 68% | 10% | 52% | 26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -13% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | 4% | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | 67% | 63% | 4% | 53% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 64% | 9% | 55% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -6% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

## 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 40 | 42 | 30 | 49 | 49 | 40 | 48 | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 55 | 56 | 50 | 50 | 35 | 20 | | | | |
| HSP | 74 | 76 | | 67 | 63 | | 79 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | 56 | | 64 | 56 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 60 | 37 | 75 | 65 | 49 | 74 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 56 | 41 | 62 | 56 | 37 | 62 | | | | |

## 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 | 43 | 43 | 34 | 50 | 62 | 44 | 62 | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 28 | 21 | 51 | 53 | 31 | 71 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 52 | 40 | 73 | 61 | 33 | 73 | | | | |
| MUL | 78 | 73 | | 87 | 75 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 53 | 37 | 77 | 75 | 58 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 49 | 37 | 69 | 67 | 46 | 75 | | | | |

## 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 | 32 | 35 | 29 | 33 | 39 | 32 | 26 | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 53 | | 50 | 58 | 31 | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 44 | | 68 | 56 | 20 | | | | | |
| MUL | 83 | 70 | | 89 | 80 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 58 | 40 | 66 | 57 | 36 | 53 | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 41 | 15 | 54 | 49 | 30 | 35 | | | | |

## ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 415 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 43 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 44 |
| 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 | 72 |
| 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 | 60 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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.**

The lowest performing area is our ELA LQ. However, we increased from 35% to 43% in 2019. Contributing factors include teachers knowledge and ability to implement small group instruction targeting lower performers, implementation of a new curriculum mid-year, lack of teacher conferencing with scholars.

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

THe area of greatest decline is Math LQ mainly in 5th grade. 2019 was our first year of implementation of Eureka Math. In addition to implementing a new curriculum, teachers also had to learn how to implement small groups targeting lower quartile/lower performing scholars.

**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.**

Our ELA LQ had the greatest gap compared to the state average.

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

We showed an increase in ELA achievement and overall gains. We used SIPPs, Making Meaning and LAFS with fidelity and began professional development in the area of small groups.

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

Our area of concern surround the lower quartile student learning gains and overall growth in both ELA and Mathematics.

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

1. Priority 1 is to increase lower quartile learning gains in the areas of reading and writing (ELA).
2. Priority 2 is to increase lower quartile learning gains in the areas of mathematics.
3.
4.
5.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

## Areas of Focus:

### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | One area of focus this school year is to increase learning gains with our lower quartile students in ELA. Our lower quartile learners did not show adequate growth in ELA compared to other students in their respective grade levels. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | LAE plans to achieve an increase of 5 percentage points with these scholars in the lower quartile for ELA |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The evidence based strategies that we will implement are the use of small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted materials which includes LAFS, SIPPs, iReady and Achieve 3000. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our students will show improvement in the area of ELA. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include LAFS, SIPPS, iReady and Achieve 3000. |

### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Another area of focus this school year is to increase learning gains with our lower quartile scholars in the area of mathematics. Our lower quartile learners did not show adequate growth in mathematics compared to other students in their respective grade levels. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | LAE plans to achieve an increase of 5 percentage points with these scholars in the lower quartile for mathematics. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The evidence-based strategies that we will implement are the use of small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted materials which include Eureka Math and MAFS. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our lower quartile students will show improvement in mathematics. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include Eureka Math and MAFS. |

### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

| #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | We will focus on our Social Emotional Learning to reduce the number of discipline referrals for inappropriate conduct or disputes with students/school board employees. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We will reduce the number of referrals by 10% |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We will incorporate the 7 Mindset lessons in every classroom and have school wide events or programs to encourage scholars to work hard and be kind always. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | |

### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**1. Priority 1 is to increase lower quartile learning gains in the areas of reading and writing (ELA).**
**2. Priority 2 is to increase lower quartile learning gains in the areas of mathematics.**

## 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.

Our mission is to increase the academic achievement of all students. Lake Asbury Elementary, working collaboratively with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Our teachers will provide rigorous and relevant learning opportunities for each child to experience academic success within a safe and inviting environment.

LAE will utilize the 7 Mindsets Curriculum to continue to build a positive school culture and learning environment.

### 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: ELA | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | $0.00 |
| | | **Total:** | **$0.00** |