

Escambia County School District

Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center

129 N MERRITT ST, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Leeanne Guy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Hope Horizon At Judy Andrews Center

129 N MERRITT ST, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

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)
Combination School KG-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

At Lakeview School Day Support (SDS) we believe all children have the ability to be successful academically and behaviorally. SDS is committed to providing a therapeutic day school program to address the individual needs of students experiencing significant behavioral and mental health challenges in their neighborhood schools. It is the goal of SDS to help students develop the coping and self regulation skills necessary to transition into less restrictive educational settings in Escambia County schools.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Lakeview School Day Support, we believe that all children have the capacity to achieve success and make progress toward their individual goals. School Day Support will strive to provide the structure and positive supports needed to enable students to realize their potential, maximize their success and reach their goals.

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
Farrish, Kim	Other	Kim is the Clinical Manager for School Day Support, and is an employee of Lakeview Center Incorporated. She works in School Day Support through the contract between ECSD and LCI. Her day to day responsibilities for the 2020/2021 school year include supervising the counselors who are employees of LCI as they provide direct individual and group counseling to students at Lakeview SDS. She will also provide counseling to students. She will provide supervision of students during crisis episodes and necessary paperwork to PPD if a Baker Act becomes necessary.
Kirkland, Tammie	Other	Tammie is the on site leader/ administrator. She facilitates day to day operations. She oversees buses, lunches, scheduling, curriculum, IEPs, field trips and all other administrative duties typically handled by an AP and CC.
Perry, Donna	Principal	Donna is a Subject Area Specialist for Emotional/ Behavioral Disabilities who also serves as the Administrator/ supervisor of Lakeview SDS. Donna coordinates all programs at School Day Support both academic and behavioral. She facilitates professional development for faculty and staff and often helps deliver PD. She oversees SDS operations, hiring, evaluations, student services, IEPs, FBA/PBIPs, contract negotiations with LCI, and parent involvement.
Storniolo, Marcia	Other	Marcia is a Board Certified Behavior Analyst. She trains staff on applied behavior analysis techniques, safety care, FBA/ PBIP development, and directly supports students in the school. She leads the schools PBIS initiatives as well and serves as an integral part of the leadership team.
Hagan, Tara	Teacher, ESE	During the 2020-2021 school year, Tara will serve on a two teacher team where she will teach reading as her primary academic focus to elementary students grades 3-5. She will also be responsible for Restorative Practices instruction with all students. She will teach Social / Emotional Learning to her homeroom and Social Skills class, and she will be responsible for the development of IEPs, FBAs, and PBIPs for her students.
Gillard, Vivian	Teacher, K-12	During the 2020-2021 school year, Vivian will serve in the secondary rotating team where she will teach primarily math to grades 6-12. She will also teach one period of HS ELA and she will be responsible for Restorative Practices instruction with all students. Additionally she will teach Social / Emotional Learning to her homeroom and Social Skills class. She is responsible for the development of IEPs, FBAs, and PBIPs for her students. Vivian is the PBS teacher leader for 2020/2021.
Derbigny, Kenan	Paraprofessional	Kenan works in the classroom as an Instructional/ Behavior Assistant. His responsibilities include directly supporting students with academic

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Patterson, Susan	Paraprofessional	Susan, works in the classroom as an Instructional/ Behavior Assistant. His responsibilities include directly supporting students with academic assignments, leading small group instruction, intervening with challenging behavior, providing behavior support including reinforcement, breaks, calming etc.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Sarah Leeanne Guy

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade

	2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	1	2	5	5	4	4	7	3	3	3	1	0	4	42
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	3	1	4	2	4	2	1	1	1	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	2	3	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	3	1	2	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	1	3	1	3	2	0	0	0	1	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/11/2020

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	1	4	3	3	6	6	3	2	2	3	0	4	37
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	3	0	3	4	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	2	4	2	3	1	1	1	0	3	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	2	1	1	0	0	2	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	7

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	1	2	0	2	6	4	3	1	1	1	0	1	22

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	4	3	3	6	6	3	2	2	3	0	4	37
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	3	0	3	4	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	2	4	2	3	1	1	1	0	3	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	2	1	1	0	0	2	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	7

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	1	2	0	2	6	4	3	1	1	1	0	1	22

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0%	64%	61%	0%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	51%	59%	0%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	54%	0%	9%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	65%	62%	0%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	47%	59%	0%	35%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	71%	56%	0%	70%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	69%	78%	0%	84%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	55%	-55%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	42%	-42%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	43%	-43%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	58%	-58%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	36%	-36%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	36%	-36%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	21%	-21%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	24%	-24%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	42%	-42%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	58%	-58%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	51%	-51%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	51%	-51%	62%	-62%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	47%	-47%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	21	23		6	15						
FRL	21			9							
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	16
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	65
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	15
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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.

Lakeview's students scoring level 1 in ELA was the lowest data component. There are a lot of contributing factors including poor student attendance, lack of exposure to reading outside of school, instability of our students when they transition into our school, refusal of our students to test which yields invalid results, and low cognitive functioning. All of the students at Lakeview have emotional and/or behavioral disabilities and mental illness. They attend school here because their behavior and mental health is interfering with their ability to successfully participate in their neighborhood school. This impacts their ability to learn and perform greatly. Many of them also have learning disabilities.

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

Attendance showed the greatest decline from the previous year. The contributing factors include parental mental illness, student mental illness which includes hospitalizations. When our students are hospitalized for mental illness, they are marked absent. We have students with anxiety that makes coming to school 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.

Our school had no data to compare to the state average.

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

Our math showed the most improvement. We focused on math as a goal last year. We added added Freckle Math. We increased one on one time with paras, and teachers instituted more contests to encourage healthy drive to learn math facts and skills.

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

Student attendance and students with one or more suspensions.

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

1. Students scoring level 1 in ELA
2. Student attendance below 90%
3. Students with one or more OSS
4. Reduce restraints and seclusions
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student attendance was the next area of concern for the School Improvement Committee. This area has a huge impact on student learning because students can't learn when they aren't engaged in the learning environment. When the committee looked at the data and saw that 50% of students had below at 90% attendance rate it was alarming.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020/2021 school year, students with an average attendance rate of 90% will improve by 10% to 60% of students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lakeview School Day Support will use Restorative Practices to build Communities and teach students the effects their behavior choices, including attendance have on themselves and others. Additionally staff will review research articles on the effects of incentives, awareness programs, and family events to promote attendance school wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting Restorative Practices was the connection between teaching students to take responsibility for their behavior, that is the premise of Restorative Practice, and the effect that would have on attendance. Students ultimately make the decision to come to school. Even in a home where parents don't encourage school attendance, if the student is motivated to attend, they will. Reviewing research regarding incentives and awareness programs was selected on the basis of ensuring that efforts are directed at meaningful interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers have completed a book study on Restorative Practices already during the spring of 2020. ESP staff will begin Restorative Practice training August of 2020.

Person Responsible Marcia Storniolo (mstorniolo@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Locate research article(s) on effective interventions for promoting student attendance and share them with leadership to develop plans to promote improved student attendance.

Person Responsible Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lakeview's School Improvement Team targeted ELA as an area of focus due to the concern that 38% of the student in the group scored a level one on FSA. The team decided to engage in intensive Reading remediation school wide for the 2020/2021 school year. Reading Eggs will be added at the early grades to provide additional targeted intervention. MyOn is also being added school wide to provide access to a digital reading resource and library. We are also able through the addition of Title 1 funds to begin building a library at Lakeview, something the students have not had access to in the past.

Measurable Outcome: Lakeview students scoring above a level 1 on the ELA assessment on STAR 360 or FSA will improve by 3% from 38% to 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: In middle and high school reading classes, Souday System will be used. Students in secondary will take an extra period of intensive reading as well. In the elementary classes, the intervention pieces of Wonders will be used along with SRA corrective reading, reading eggs, reading A-Z, and iready.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Souday System was selected for Students with Disabilities reading below grade level by the ESE department. It was selected because it is an evidenced based strategy that targets older students who are still struggling with fluency skills. SRA corrective reading is endorsed by our reading/ ELA department for use with our lowest, struggling readers based on research. Reading egg, reading A-Z and iready are all computer based programs that have proven to support student growth in reading. Our student population is diverse and challenging and our teachers realize that they need different tools to reach different students.

Action Steps to Implement

Souday System materials will need to be ordered through the ELA/ Reading Department. Deborah Watkins, secondary reading teacher has already been trained in the Souday System, but she has requested to attend training again in July of 2020 since she has not taught the program. She would like to have her assistants trained. Find out when training is scheduled and if paras are willing to attend.

Person Responsible Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

Order reading eggs after July 1, 2020

Person Responsible Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

Order Myon after July 1, 2020

Person Responsible Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

Contact ELA and find out if paras can attend Souday System training, contact paras for Deborah Watkins and see if they are willing to attend.

Person Responsible Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: When looking at our EWS, the team saw that 18 of our 42 students had one or more out of school suspension. That shows 43% of our students with at least one OSS. Although all of our students are students with Emotional/ Behavioral Disabilities who attend Lakeview School Day Support due to significant interfering behaviors, we would like to see that percent decrease.

Measurable Outcome: After reviewing and analyzing the data, the team determined a goal to reduce the number of students with one or more OSS by 3%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marcia Storniolo (mstorniolo@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative Practices is the evidenced based strategy that will be used to achieve this goal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting Restorative Practice is the success this program has in reducing OSS in students with significant behavioral challenges. The program teaches students to take responsibility for their actions by replacing punishment with accountability. Students learn to face what they have done and the harm it has cause to their school/ classroom community. This practice enables the school to work with the student and teach replacement behaviors rather than suspend them expecting that act of punishment to change the behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers have already begun the process by participating in a book study during the spring of 2020 through google meets. ESPs will begin training in August of 2020.

Person Responsible Marcia Storniolo (mstorniolo@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Students will participate in Restorative Practices beginning the first day of school 2020. The program is a daily embedded part of school, not a response to challenging behavior.

Person Responsible Donna Perry (dperry@ecsdfi.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Lakeview will also focus on reducing Restraints & Seclusions during the 20/21 school year. The action plan includes:

Implementation of prevention programs such as Restorative Practices

Training all staff on Safety Care for prevention, intervention, and de escalation

Daily debriefing of any restraint or seclusion

bi-weekly leadership meetings to review restraint/ seclusion data. These meetings will be used to identify areas in need of safety care review, training needs, additional staff support needs etc.

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.

Lakeview School Day Support strives to build a positive school culture by ensuring involvement from all stakeholders. Teachers and support staff are involved in decision making through surveys, involvement in committees including the School Improvement Committee, PBIS team, leadership team, Threat Assessment Team, Graduation Committee, etc. The Principal uses a weekly email on Fridays to share information in an effort to keep everyone informed and connected. The Principal also chooses a theme each year such as "Random Acts of Kindness" and uses that theme to promote activities that build teamwork and relationships among faculty. Enhancing a positive atmosphere in the workplace is crucial to the success of what goes on with the students. Parents are asked to get involved at intake. Students are referred to Lakeview SDS through an IEP review and at that meeting the Administrator explains the importance of parental input. The parent's concerns as well as what they want from the program are captured in the IEP and treatment plan, and those are then embedded into what we do in the school. While our school is unlike any other school in the district, we work very hard to give our students a typical school experience and incorporate all of the typical school functions as much as possible. This fall our school theme is School Community. Building off the Restorative Practices model, we will promote a sense of positive school community and relationship building as we invest in the lives of our students. We strive to create a positive environment where students feel safe and accepted. We want them to want to be present so they have the courage to work on their behavior and mental health challenges AND get their education.

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: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00