

Clay County Schools

# Lakeside Junior High 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>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>20</b> |

# Lakeside Junior High School

2750 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ljh.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Dustin James**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 46%  |
| <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: A (72%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)<br>2016-17: A (65%)<br>2015-16: A (62%)   |
| <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>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](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>20</b> |

## Lakeside Junior High School

2750 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ljh.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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | No                     | 34%  |
| 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                     | 32%  |

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

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

Lakeside Junior High School is dedicated to providing a safe physical environment so that each student can obtain the tools necessary to be successful in the twenty-first century. This is accomplished by establishing high positive expectations, mutual self-respect among students and staff, and community involvement to enable students to become confident, self-directed, life-long learners.

### 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 |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Graham, Christy    | Principal                 |                                 |
| Warmouth, Nathan   | Assistant Principal       |                                 |
| Davis, Hope        | Assistant Principal       |                                 |
| Anschuetz, Kim     | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Duchemin, Michelle | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Hiscox, Julie      | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Holmgren, Rachel   | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Howington, Elba    | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Jones, Johnathan   | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Matz, Melissa      | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Williams, Kelly    | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Hube, Shannnon     | Teacher, Career/Technical |                                 |
| Lowe, Vicki        | Other                     |                                 |
| McCorduck, Kerry   | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |
| Bumpers, Sherry    | Teacher, K-12             |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Dustin James

**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.*

2

**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.*

17

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

55

### 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>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 46%  |
| <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: A (72%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)<br>2016-17: A (65%)<br>2015-16: A (62%)   |
| <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>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 417 | 468 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 885 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1   |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4   |       |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 45  | 45  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36  | 40  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 76  |       |

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 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

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 | 3 | 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

Monday 9/28/2020

### 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 | 0 | 399 | 462 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 861 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25  | 39  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 64  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3   |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2   |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46  | 68  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 114 |       |

**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 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

**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     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 399 | 462 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 861 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25  | 39  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 64  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3   |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2   |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46  | 68  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 114 |       |

**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 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8  |

**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        | 71%    | 61%      | 54%   | 68%    | 60%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains     | 64%    | 58%      | 54%   | 62%    | 58%      | 54%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 56%    | 49%      | 47%   | 48%    | 45%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 78%    | 69%      | 58%   | 77%    | 69%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 65%    | 63%      | 57%   | 69%    | 65%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 65%    | 56%      | 51%   | 53%    | 53%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 74%    | 66%      | 51%   | 68%    | 60%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 90%    | 81%      | 72%   | 87%    | 81%      | 70%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
|           | 6                                 | 7   | 8   |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

### Grade Level Data

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 74%    | 59%      | 15%                        | 52%   | 22%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 62%    | 54%      | 8%                         | 51%   | 11%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 12%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 74%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 69%    | 62%      | 7%                         | 56%   | 13%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 75%    | 67%      | 8%                         | 58%   | 17%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 79%    | 63%      | 16%                        | 54%   | 25%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 61%    | 58%      | 3%                         | 54%   | 7%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 18%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 79%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 48%    | 49%      | -1%                        | 46%   | 2%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 64%    | 52%      | 12%                        | 45%   | 19%                     |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -16%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 74%    | 64%      | 10%                        | 48%   | 26%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 76%    | 67%      | 9%                         | 50%   | 26%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 92%    | 80%      | 12%                   | 71%   | 21%                |
| 2018         | 79%    | 78%      | 1%                    | 71%   | 8%                 |
| Compare      |        | 13%      |                       |       |                    |
| 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         | 92%    | 65%      | 27%                   | 61%   | 31%                |
| 2018         | 99%    | 66%      | 33%                   | 62%   | 37%                |
| Compare      |        | -7%      |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 100%   | 64%      | 36%                   | 57%   | 43%                |
| 2018         | 100%   | 61%      | 39%                   | 56%   | 44%                |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

**Subgroup Data**

| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| SWD  | 34              | 53            | 55                 | 42               | 54             | 58                  | 32              | 69             | 74               |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 44              | 53            |                    | 29               | 41             |                     | 42              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ASN  | 71              | 44            |                    | 81               | 87             |                     |                 |                | 60               |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 62              | 61            | 46                 | 65               | 63             | 63                  | 48              | 92             | 70               |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 65              | 68            | 56                 | 76               | 61             | 71                  | 73              | 90             | 88               |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 71              | 46            | 50                 | 78               | 71             | 63                  | 75              | 86             | 87               |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 74              | 67            | 60                 | 80               | 65             | 65                  | 78              | 91             | 84               |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 62              | 63            | 56                 | 70               | 63             | 66                  | 60              | 85             | 78               |                          |                                |
| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| SWD  | 31              | 51            | 45                 | 33               | 45             | 37                  | 33              | 43             | 53               |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 29              | 56            | 40                 | 43               | 47             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ASN  | 78              | 67            |                    | 89               | 61             |                     | 85              |                | 86               |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 58              | 66            | 52                 | 64               | 54             | 48                  | 52              | 73             | 75               |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 65              | 59            | 42                 | 67               | 58             | 54                  | 73              | 73             | 78               |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 70              | 74            | 69                 | 76               | 52             | 50                  | 90              | 83             | 83               |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 71              | 62            | 52                 | 78               | 67             | 54                  | 78              | 82             | 79               |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 56              | 56            | 44                 | 65               | 56             | 51                  | 69              | 71             | 66               |                          |                                |
| <b>2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b> |
| SWD  | 31              | 44            | 38                 | 37               | 49             | 46                  | 36              | 66             | 10               |                          |                                |
| ASN  | 77              | 80            |                    | 91               | 95             |                     |                 | 100            | 91               |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 38              | 51            | 53                 | 47               | 55             | 58                  | 35              | 71             | 35               |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 62              | 60            | 65                 | 70               | 58             | 48                  | 67              | 92             | 46               |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 74              | 58            |                    | 79               | 67             |                     | 87              | 79             | 71               |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 71              | 62            | 43                 | 80               | 71             | 52                  | 70              | 88             | 51               |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 53              | 55            | 49                 | 64               | 58             | 50                  | 58              | 73             | 34               |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| 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 | 40  |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                      | 686 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 10  |
| Percent Tested   | 99% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 52  |
| 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                                      | 42  |
| 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   | 69  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 63  |
| 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   | 70  |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 74  |
| 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                                | 67  |
| 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.**

ELA Lower Quartile.

In previous years, one of the contributing factors seemed to be attendance. Some students had reading Lexiles that decreased, along with their FSA scores. Last year, due to crisis learning we had some drop in lexile scores, so we will continue to focus in this area for improvement.

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

Science Achievement. A contributing factor to our achievement in Science decreasing was Lexile levels fell in ELA. Reading is such an important component that allows students to navigate thoroughly through a text. If students are unable to do that, then comprehension becomes very difficult.

**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.**

8th grade Math Achievement (+20%) had the most significant gap compared to the state average. An excellent problem to have is that many of our 8th graders are taking Algebra I and Geometry, which leads to some of our Bottom Quartile students taking 8th grade math.

Not intentionally focusing more on our ESE/lower quartile students was a direct result of the gap between us and the state. Also having grade-appropriate material was an issue as well. Many times we lower the quality of work for our students so they won't struggle, but it ends up hurting them more. A different teaching style might have played a part in that equation as well.

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

Social Studies Achievement increased by 10% from the previous year. The Civics department focused more on the item specs than general material. Also, closely throughout the year, maintain constant conversations with students about their progress from quarterly assessments.

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

The focus on Intensive Reading will be a priority for us this year. Many of these students are in our BQ, so as we continue to help them increase their Lexile scores, so will their achievement levels across all subjects.

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

1. Climate and Culture
2. ELA lower quartile
3. 8th grade Pre-Algebra
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Other specifically relating to ELA Lower Quartile****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

ELA is our lower performing area in our school.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The Lower Quartile will increase to 57%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christy Graham (christy.graham@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Classroom walk-throughs, coaching sessions with teachers, using iReady diagnostics and Achieve data to differentiate instruction to meet students' needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

These strategies will increase engagement, rigor, grade-level appropriate instruction, and academic ownership.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. iReady and Achieve diagnostics data
2. Coaching sessions with teachers
3. Monthly professional development
4. Weekly PLC's to discuss common assessments and lesson planning
5. Introduction to small group instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Christy Graham (christy.graham@myoneclay.net)

**#2. Other specifically relating to 8th Grade Pre-Algebra**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Even though we were 78% proficiency in Math last year, we were only 48% proficient in 8th grade Pre-Algebra according to our FSA data.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>  | 8th grade Pre-Algebra will increase to 55% proficiency this school year.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>   | Christy Graham (christy.graham@myoneclay.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>   | Classroom walk-throughs, coaching sessions with teachers, using iReady diagnostics to differentiate instruction to meet students' needs. Along with quarterly performance tests to measure student growth. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>   | These strategies will increase engagement, rigor, grade-level appropriate instruction, and academic ownership.   |
| <b>Action Steps to Implement</b>  |  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. iReady diagnostics data</li> <li>2. Coaching sessions with teachers</li> <li>3. Monthly professional development</li> <li>4. Weekly PLC's to discuss common assessments and lesson planning</li> <li>5. Introduction to small group instruction.</li> <li>6. Data-Driven instruction from the quarterly performance matters tests.</li> </ol> |  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>   | Christy Graham (christy.graham@myoneclay.net)  |

**#3. Other specifically relating to Social & Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** All students will be engaged and active learners who are self-aware, caring, respectful, connected to others, responsible decision makers, and academic achievers. Teachers, students, families, and community members will work together to support the healthy development of all students

**Measurable Outcome:** Our school will implement and use consistently the 7 mindsets curriculum for social and emotional learning with students, teachers and families. At the end of the school year 80% or more of our students, teachers, families will have a better understanding and respect for social/emotional learning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christy Graham (christy.graham@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**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.

**We are in the process of setting up peer tutoring for students starting in mid October and continuing for the remainder of the semester to assist students with their study skills and work habits to improve their current grades. The program will then turn into a Math and ELA FSA prep program for 2nd semester (January-April).**

**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 Junior High focuses on providing a supportive and fulfilling environment, which includes learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, and the faculty and staff are confident in their roles and relationships in student learning, within a school culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. We are firm believers that parent and community stakeholder involvement is crucial to the ensuring our students reach their full potential and excel at all educational challenges.

#### **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: Other: ELA Lower Quartile          | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: 8th Grade Pre-Algebra       | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Social & Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |  | \$0.00 |