

Clay County Schools

Lakeside Elementary School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
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: 12/1/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	19
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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wolfe, Dawn	Principal	Supervisor of school and all school activities. Works collaboratively with stakeholders to ensure students are receiving high levels of instruction.
Fowler, Christy	Assistant Principal	Head of discipline and Inservice Coordinator
Dotson, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for Kindergarten
Johns, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 1st grade
Halifko, Lucille	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 2nd grade
Thomas, Kristal	Teacher, K-12	Co team leader for 3rd grade
Travis, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Co team leader for 3rd grade
Jewell, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 4th grade
Long, Anne	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 5th grade
Davis, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Team leader for 6th grade
Loveland, Christine	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team leader
Jernigan, Kelly	Instructional Media	Resource team leader and Intervention Team Facilitator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 12/1/2018, 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

758

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	107	97	116	112	93	109	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	751
Attendance below 90 percent	29	18	24	20	21	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	5	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/29/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				72%	65%	57%	65%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				75%	62%	58%	54%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	54%	53%	37%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				77%	70%	63%	73%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	66%	62%	76%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	56%	51%	73%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	65%	53%	61%	66%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	70%	68%	2%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	64%	11%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
06	2021					
	2019	68%	64%	4%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	71%	-2%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
06	2021					
	2019	89%	70%	19%	55%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	58%	63%	-5%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady Reading and Math assessments were used to compile this data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	47	75
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	12	44	57
Mathematics	English Language Learners	0	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	47	72
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	19	31	44
	English Language Learners	0	50	100
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	53	66
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7	19	39
Mathematics	English Language Learners	0	0	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	34	55
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7	20	36
	English Language Learners	14	14	50

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	68	71
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	35	35	41
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	51	62
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4	22	46
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	42	51
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4	0	16
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	45	66
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	32
	English Language Learners	0	0	33

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42	43	55
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8	12	12
	English Language Learners	42	45	55
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	47	60
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4	19	32
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	49	52
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	59	70
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	26	22	32
	English Language Learners	25	25	50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	70	87
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5	37	63
	English Language Learners	0	25	50

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	31	46	48	38	52	52	15				
ELL	70	75		55	67						
BLK	42	56	40	44	56	45	20				
HSP	66	63		60	64		47				
MUL	79	50		65	33						
WHT	72	68	71	72	70	72	62				
FRL	56	63	58	53	64	58	37				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

There continues to be a need for Lakeside to focus on the categories of SWD and ELL across all grade levels in Reading and Math. We will need to identify the specific learning challenges these students have and provide targeted interventions so that they can be academically successful and make the necessary learning gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

A continued focus in the area of Reading needs to occur. Progress monitoring data shows that our SWD population are making minimum learning gains from the start of the year to the end. State assessment data shows that our bottom quartile students are also not making substantial learning gains.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

One contributing factor was trying to overcome the loss of learning from the 2019-2020 school. Another contributing factor was that some students participated in online learning and were not engaged as they should have been. Teachers are prepared to identify deficiencies early in the year so that maximum time can be spent on remediating them.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

One area that showed great improvement on progress monitoring and state assessments was 6th grade Reading and Math in all subgroups (ELL and SWD).

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

6th-grade teachers planned very intentional lessons from the start of the year through the end. Instruction was rigorous and standards-based. Students were prepared to take state assessments and were able to demonstrate their learning successfully.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Continued focus on differentiated small group instruction, identification of specific deficiencies especially in the area of reading with all students, and targeted interventions to remediate. Use of new core Reading materials with fidelity. Frequent data analysis that will take place during weekly PLCs.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Weekly PLCs will be taking place for teachers to lesson plan, using the standards, and to analyze data from assessments. Teachers will also continue to participate in county and school-based professional development.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

A new reading curriculum has been adopted by the county. Continued training with the new series will continue throughout the year. The administration will continue to provide feedback from walkthroughs to the teachers that will occur on a regular basis. Teachers will continue to use new supplemental reading materials to help provide targeted instruction in the area of REading

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the ELA FSA data from the 20-21 school year, one area of focus will be the ELA Learning gains of the bottom quartile and overall learning gains of students 4-6th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	FSA data shows that the overall percentage of students with learning gains in the area of ELA was 66%. The goal is to increase this percentage to 69%. For the bottom quartile students, the data shows that only 60% demonstrated learning gains. The goal will be to increase this to 65%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including SAVVAS assessments, DIBELS Next, Lexia Core 5, iReady Diagnostics, and classroom performance. Teachers will use PLC time to determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The bottom quartile students have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction. New evidence-based supplemental materials have been purchased to use with students along with a new Reading series. There will be more of a focus placed on the identification of the specific reading deficiency the student has and matching a specific intervention to remediate that deficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide data and the bottom quartile report were used to determine these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Small group instruction

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

PLC - to analyze data and identification of power standards

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

Data meetings

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Math FSA data from the 20-21 school year, one area of focus will be the Math Learning gains of the bottom quartile and overall learning gains of students 4-6th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	FSA data shows that the overall percentage of students with learning gains in the area of Math was 66%. The goal is to increase this percentage to 69%. For the bottom quartile students, the data shows that only 63% demonstrated learning gains. The goal will be to increase this to 66%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including Eureka Module Assessments, iReady Diagnostic, and classroom performance. Teachers will use PLC time to determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The bottom quartile students have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide data and the bottom quartile report were used to determine these strategies.
Action Steps to Implement	
Small group instruction	
Person Responsible	Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)
PLC - analyze data and identification of power standards	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Data Meetings	
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 positive learning environment be established at Lakeside Elementary. Students are more likely to perform at a higher academic level when they are in an environment that is supportive of their needs. Students completed a district-created survey last year in which several key areas of social-emotional learning were identified for Lakeside to focus on.

Measurable Outcome: According to our walkthrough data, Q1 to Q4 our "students acknowledge for positive behavior will increase by 40%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored by having conversations with students and the completion of another survey during the school year to assess feelings in these areas. It will also be monitored through the walkthrough dashboard.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Multiple structures and processes throughout the school year will be used to create ways so that students don't feel this way. This work will be completed through the PBIS team and Administration. Teachers will be provided with a rubric that addresses what this type of strategy could look like in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Student survey results were used to select these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration talking to students during the annual Lakeside 101 program.

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

Laker Legend Program

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

7 Mindset Program

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

Teachers will receive information on examples and look fors by the administration.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Discipline data will be monitored through our PBIS team monthly. Lakeside now has a Behavior Resource Teacher that will help with implementing strategies with students and teachers to prevent issues from becoming discipline issues. Lakeside falls into the Low category with .3 incidents per 100 students. Our suspension data falls into the Middle category. This will be an area of focus. One strategy will be to look for alternatives to suspension.

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.

Lakeside Elementary works hard to provide an environment in which students feel safe and supported. We want students to work hard and be recognized for this hard work. There are multiple opportunities and established programs for students to be recognized for their behavior and academic performance. The Laker Legend is one way students are recognized for positive behavior choices. Students can receive a laker legend ticket from any staff member. Those tickets are placed in a basket in the cafeteria. Twelve tickets are pulled daily and those students are recognized on the morning announcements. Their tickets are placed on a board with another opportunity to be recognized. There is the Principal's Award that is done quarterly. Students are also recognized for academic performance through the A/AB Honor Roll quarterly. Teachers have adopted the mindset that it doesn't matter what grade level a student is, they are all of our students. Teachers and staff members welcome students to campus every morning with a smile and a "Good Morning". Teachers stand at their doors every morning to welcome students into their rooms. We use the 7 Mindsets program to help build a positive school culture. Weekly lessons are completed with the students. Lakeside has a PBIS committee and Family and Community Engagement committee that also work towards building positive school culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All individuals that work at Lakeside Elementary are involved in promoting a positive culture and environment. Each grade has a representative on the PBIS committee as well as the Parent and Community Engagement Committee. Lakeside's PFA is also actively involved in creating a positive culture and environment at Lakeside.