

Clay County Schools

Lakeside Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Lakeside Elementary School

2752 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://les.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Wolfe

Start Date for this Principal: 11/27/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-6 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 63% |
| 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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (60%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Lakeside Elementary School

2752 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://les.oneclay.net>

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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-6 | No | 66% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 40% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 11/27/2018, Dawn Wolfe

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.*

6

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

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) | 63% |
| 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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (60%) |
| 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 | 84 | 111 | 95 | 92 | 102 | 113 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 702 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 14 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| | 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 | 120 | 110 | 85 | 103 | 107 | 100 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 737 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 120 | 110 | 85 | 103 | 107 | 100 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 737 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| | (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 | 70% | 68% | 2% | 58% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 68% | -9% | 57% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 75% | 64% | 11% | 58% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 62% | 6% | 56% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 67% | 62% | 5% | 56% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 59% | 0% | 55% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 68% | 64% | 4% | 54% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 63% | 5% | 52% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

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

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 26% | | | | |

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

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 29 | 58 | 45 | 45 | 74 | 70 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | | | 46 | 70 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | 50 | | 82 | 90 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | 61 | 31 | 60 | 62 | 53 | 31 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 74 | 42 | 75 | 86 | 82 | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | 81 | | 93 | 94 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | 78 | 69 | 79 | 83 | 73 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 72 | 56 | 74 | 81 | 76 | 58 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 20 | 34 | 29 | 41 | 67 | 64 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 47 | 83 | | 67 | 83 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | 44 | 50 | 57 | 77 | 73 | | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 54 | 40 | 69 | 65 | 65 | 59 | | | | |
| MUL | 70 | 45 | | 70 | 71 | | 70 | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 56 | 33 | 77 | 79 | 79 | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | 50 | 39 | 66 | 73 | 74 | 59 | | | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 29 | 51 | 53 | 42 | 68 | 72 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 54 | | 50 | 69 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 51 | 50 | 61 | 80 | 78 | 54 | | | | |
| HSP | 61 | 65 | 60 | 67 | 71 | 76 | 44 | | | | |
| MUL | 84 | 71 | | 80 | 81 | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 71 | 67 | 72 | 73 | 75 | 70 | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 63 | 65 | 63 | 74 | 80 | 57 | | | | |

ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 54 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 550 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 48 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 54 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 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 | 76 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 51 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 67 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 87 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 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 | 75 |
| 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 | 69 |
| 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.

Due to the pandemic, FSA testing did not take place during the 2019-2020 school year. This data is from the 2018-2019 FSA. School-wide data shows that the group that had the lowest performance percentage was our bottom 25% in the area of ELA. More specifically was the bottom 25% in 5th grade in the area of ELA. Our bottom quartile is mostly comprised of ESE students. The majority of these students based on local assessments (iReady data) were performing at one to two grade levels below their current grade.

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

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

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

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

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

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

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

As of this point, we don't have any students showing 2 or more indicators. If students are identified through the EWS system they will be tracked and monitored consistently. If more students arise with 2 or more indicators, they will also be tracked, monitored, and assisted through the Student Success Team meeting process.

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>ELA Learning Gains Bottom Quartile Results</p> <p>This is still a continued area of weakness in spite of the 21% increase (37% to 58%) that took place from the previous year.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | Lakeside Elementary will continue to make learning gains in the bottom quartile for ELA by achieving an increase to 60%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The lowest quartile students have been identified and teachers are tracking and monitoring those students on a daily basis. Those students are receiving differentiated small group instruction with their teacher. Students will use LAFS for whole group instruction. They will use Achieve 3000 and iReady to support classroom instruction. Bottom quartile students will also be the first students to receive an offer for after school tutoring. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | School-wide data and the bottom quartile report were used to identify these students and the area of opportunity for our school. |
| Action Steps to Implement | |
| Small group instruction | |
| Person Responsible | Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net) |
| After-school tutoring | |
| Person Responsible | Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net) |
| Monitoring of local assessment data in the area of Reading (Achieve and iReady) | |
| Person Responsible | Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net) |

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus | Math Learning Gains Bottom Quartile |
| Description and Rationale: | This is an area of opportunity, in spite of achieving 71% this was a decrease from the previous year of 73%. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Lakeside Elementary will continue to make learning gains in the bottom quartile for Math by achieving an increase to 73%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The lowest quartile students have been identified and teachers are tracking and monitoring those students on a daily basis. Those students are receiving differentiated small group instruction with their teacher. Students will utilize Eureka Math for whole group instruction and will also utilize iReady Math Toolbox for support. Bottom quartile students will also be the first students to receive an offer for after school tutoring. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | School-wide data and the bottom quartile report were used to identify those students and the area of opportunity for our school. |
| Action Steps to Implement | |
| . Small-Group Instruction | |
| Person Responsible | Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net) |
| Monitoring iReady Data, mid module, and end of module assessments | |
| Person Responsible | Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net) |
| After School Tutoring Services | |
| Person Responsible | Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net) |

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: It is important that a culture of care is established at Lakeside. Students are more likely to perform at a higher level when they are in an environment that is supportive of their needs. Student data from the Winter Panorama Survey showed that students want to feel safe and respected while at school.

Measurable Outcome: Through a district-provided survey or a school created survey 75% of students that are surveyed, will respond in a positive manner that supports the idea that they feel supported and safe at school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The 7 Mindsets program will be implemented this year at Lakeside across all grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This program has been approved by the county.

Action Steps to Implement

7 Mindset information will be shared on the morning announcements every day.

Person Responsible Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

7 Mindsets lessons will be taught weekly across the grade levels.

Person Responsible Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will meet on a regular basis to monitor schoolwide improvement priorities. Data meetings will also be held as needed to monitor progress monitoring data.

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.

Lakeside Elementary has reinstated the PFA and has created a school committee devoted to Family and Community Engagement. The 2 committees will work together to create activities to build positive relationships with all stakeholders. Additionally, Lakeside has increased its use of Social Media, Robocalls, Positive Phone Calls Home, and flyers for events. We also have held and plan to hold a variety of informative and recreational events to increase positive relationships such as Open House, Eureka Math Night, Fall Family Fun Night, Evening Conferences, STEM is in the Air Evening, and much more. The School Advisory Council will meet quarterly at a minimum. SAC and PFA will provide input at meetings for SIP and family involvement. Numerous other programs have been created to build a positive culture at the school. Teachers have the opportunity to write students up on positive office referrals. These students are recognized by the Principal with a positive phone call home. Students can earn Laker Legend tickets from their teachers. These are earned by demonstrating our "LAKER" qualities. Students are recognized daily on the morning announcements.

Lakeside is staffed with 2 guidance counselors who are available to provide support for all students on an as-needed basis. They also provide social-emotional lessons within the classrooms. Additionally, we have the services of a school psychologist and social worker to aid in situations in which advice or help is needed.

The administration is providing professional development on classroom discipline and positive behavior supports to increase relationship building with the students. There will also be a professional development session to guide teachers on how to teach students who suffer from trauma-related incidents. We also have a military life counselor who frequently pulls small groups of students whose parents are active military.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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