

Sarasota County Schools

Lakeview 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	13
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	31
Budget to Support Goals	32

Lakeview Elementary School

7299 HAND RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/lakeview

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Wheatley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	31%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (81%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Sarasota 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	13
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	32

Lakeview Elementary School

7299 HAND RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/lakeview

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 KG-5	No	29%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

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 Sarasota 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.

Lakeview Elementary School in partnership with students' families and our community, provides students with high quality, challenging curriculum in a nurturing environment, preparing them for a lifetime of decision making and future success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Lakeview Elementary School community believes learning occurs in a safe, positive, and respectful environment. Our dedication to interactive, individualized, lifelong learning empowers students to lead successful lives and confidently face the challenges of tomorrow.

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
Wheatley, Lisa	Principal	<p>Primary Duties/Responsibilities Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Serves as the instructional leader of the school, which includes setting, support, and monitoring rigorous standards for teacher instruction and student achievement. -Provides and promotes a positive school climate that reflects a culture of excellence, teamwork, and collaboration among the staff, teachers, students, and families. -Ensures an orderly learning environment focused on the safety, security, and well-being of all students, staff, and visitors. -Leads leadership team that includes assistant principal, instructional facilitators, ESE liaison, and Guidance Counselor. This team meets weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted. -Leads Literacy Leadership Team that includes assistant principal, instructional facilitator, ESE liaison, Reading Recovery teacher and grade-level representatives. Lakeview's Literacy Leadership Team will meet regularly to analyze data, participate in ongoing professional dialogue and make instructional decisions based on the school's needs. The Literacy Leadership Team will also identify resources and professional development needs to support literacy goals. -Meets with and leads team leaders in facilitating instructional excellence amongst their teams. Team leaders along with instructional facilitators collaboratively facilitate the Multi-Tiered System of Support with a focus on the framework of highly impactful Tier 1 instruction, as well as targeted Tier 2 and 3 interventions.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Works directly with principal to support and monitoring rigorous standards for teacher instruction and student achievement. -Provides and promotes a positive school climate that reflects a culture of excellence, teamwork, and collaboration among the staff, teachers, students, and families. -Ensures an orderly learning environment focused on the safety, security, and well-being of all students, staff, and visitors. -Member of leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted.</p> <p>-Serves as the LEA representative and leads ESE team in collaboration with ESE liaison to ensure highly effective individualized instruction for students with IEPs.</p>
Piatt, Lauren	School Counselor	<p>-Member of the leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted.</p> <p>-Provides whole class lessons, small group, and individual counseling to help students cope effectively with personal, social, academic, and family concerns.</p> <p>-Collaborates with mental health counselors and other supporting agencies to provide resources and services as warranted.</p>
Holmes, Stacey	Other	<p>-Member of leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted.</p> <p>-Serves as ESE Liason, maintaining a working knowledge and ensures ESE meeting procedures and Individual Education Plans are meeting the needs of students and are in compliance with federal, state, and local rules and regulations regarding the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) district-level programming.</p> <p>--Serves as the LEA representative and leads ESE team in collaboration with the assistant principal to ensure highly effective individualized instruction for students with IEPs.</p>
Binswanger, Ali	Instructional Coach	<p>-Member of the leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>-Serves as the Instructional Math Coach promoting active learning in the classroom using board-adopted curriculum and other appropriate learning resources and activities. Provide support in coaching and modeling effective teaching strategies within the classroom by planning and executing well-designed lessons and interventions.</p> <p>-Attends and co-facilitates Collaborative Planning teams to analyze data and trends, addressing Tier 1 instructional strategies, creating intervention groups, and planning targeted interventions to meet the needs of struggling learners.</p>
Tirabassi, Andrea	Reading Coach	<p>-Member of the leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted.</p> <p>-Serves as the Instructional English Language Arts Coach promoting active learning in the classroom using board-adopted curriculum and other appropriate learning resources and activities. Provide support in coaching and modeling effective teaching strategies within the classroom by planning and executing well-designed lessons and interventions.</p> <p>-Attends and co-facilitates Collaborative Planning teams to analyze data and trends, addressing Tier 1 instructional strategies, creating intervention groups, and planning targeted interventions to meet the needs of struggling learners.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Lisa Wheatley

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.*

7

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

675

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

6

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

10

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	74	98	107	97	114	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	2	4	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/26/2021

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	74	98	106	97	112	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	2	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	74	98	106	97	112	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	2	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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				80%	68%	57%	79%	66%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	62%	58%	70%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	53%	53%	54%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				88%	73%	63%	90%	72%	62%
Math Learning Gains				79%	67%	62%	85%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73%	53%	51%	81%	51%	47%
Science Achievement				81%	65%	53%	91%	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	76%	70%	6%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	67%	8%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	68%	12%	56%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	86%	73%	13%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	83%	72%	11%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	89%	70%	19%	60%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	81%	65%	16%	53%	28%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used to compile the data below are iReady and the Science Benchmark assessment.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	77	97
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	82	87
	Students With Disabilities	8	54	100
	English Language Learners	0	33	75
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	75	98
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	68	91
	Students With Disabilities	23	46	100
	English Language Learners	0	33	100

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	80	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	71	93
	Students With Disabilities	20	30	50
	English Language Learners	100	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45	72	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	61	100
	Students With Disabilities	30	50	70
	English Language Learners	0	50	100
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75	82	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	63	81
	Students With Disabilities	15	23	33
	English Language Learners	50	33	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35	64	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	63	76
	Students With Disabilities	15	23	31
	English Language Learners	50	33	25

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	71	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	80	88
	Students With Disabilities	14	46	36
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40	63	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	44	79
	Students With Disabilities	17	54	67
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	69	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	64	64
	Students With Disabilities	8	15	13
	English Language Learners	25	25	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	71	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	48	73
	Students With Disabilities	15	31	38
	English Language Learners	50	75	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			66
	Economically Disadvantaged			54
	Students With Disabilities			15
	English Language Learners			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	32	23	27	43	38		15				
ELL	61			78							
HSP	64	75		66	62		59				
MUL	76			86							
WHT	76	61	36	76	64	39	67				
FRL	57	59	27	65	66	50	53				
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	28	45	33	61	64	59	36				
ELL	46	50		85	64						
HSP	71	60	30	88	81	75	69				
MUL	85			85							
WHT	81	68	47	89	78	71	83				
FRL	62	55	35	80	73	76	66				
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	27	42	32	48	69	72	80				
ELL	58	58		58	92						
HSP	77	72		85	80		83				
MUL	60			90							
WHT	79	69	58	90	86	83	91				
FRL	71	62	41	81	85	73	84				

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	64
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	91
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	77
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	81
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	60
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	54
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?

Across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas trends identified are as following:

-Learning gains for students falling in the bottom quartile continue to be significantly below the learning gains for all students. In 2019, there was a 21 percentage point difference in ELA and a 6 percentage point difference in Math. In 2021, there was a 23 percentage point difference in ELA and a 32 percentage point difference in Math.

-There has been a significant decrease in performance levels for all students in Science. In 2019, there was a 10 percentage point decrease in proficiency, followed by an additional 15 percentage point decrease in 2021.

-Students with disabilities have shown a decrease in both Math and Science proficiency, as well as a decrease in learning gains. From 2019 to 2021, there was an 18 percentage point difference in Math. In 2019, there was a 21 percentage point difference in ELA and a 6 percentage point difference in Math. In 2021, there was a 23 percentage point difference in ELA and a 32 percentage point difference in Math proficiency, and a 15 percentage point difference in Math proficiency. From 2019 to 2021, in regards to learning gains, there was a 22 percentage point difference in ELA and a 26 percentage point difference in Math.

Lakeview Elementary School met criteria in all ESSA subgroup categories.

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

The data component that demonstrates the lowest performance was the percent of students in our lowest 25% making learning gains in ELA. This has been a trend that has been our lowest-performing school grade component for the last three years. (2018-58%; 2019-47%; 2021-27%)

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

Contributing factors for this need for improvement include remote learning as well as the combination of staff illness, absences, and maternity leaves. Additionally, the "newness" of staff either to their grade and/or content is contributed to the decline from prior years.

New actions to be taken to address this need include the intensified use of Leveled Literacy Intervention System (LLI) in conjunction with Benchmark intervention resources to lift the literacy achievement of students who are not achieving grade-level expectations in reading. Additionally, the hiring of two instructional facilitators will work directly with teachers to collaborate in planning high expertise teaching at the Tier 1 level. The facilitators will also focus on identifying learning gaps and supporting teachers in developing a progression of highly targeted interventions as part of the multi-tiered system of supports.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement in 2019 was Grade 5 English Language Arts. In 2019, 80% of students demonstrated proficiency. In 2021, we demonstrated improvements in Grade 4 ELA, with a two percentage point increase.

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

Contributing factors and actions that lead to this increase were the collaboration between District curriculum specialists and teachers to plan for differentiated instruction. Lesson plans included tailoring of instruction to meet individual needs by differentiating between content, process, products, and/or the learning environment. The use of ongoing assessments and flexible grouping made this a successful approach to instruction, as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

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

In order to accelerate learning several key strategies will be implemented including:

- Alignment of human resources to maximize intervention support, this includes Advanced Work teachers providing interventions to struggling learners.
- Weekly substitutes to provide 1/2 coverage to allow for teacher observation of highly effective teachers.
- Coverage to allow for the support of District staff to provide content-specific training for teachers, with an emphasis on new teachers.
- Hiring of two Instructional Facilitators (ELA and Math) to assist in identifying students and specific learning gaps, as well as resources to target interventions.
- Hiring of two contracted service providers to provide additional interventions to targeted students.

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.

Professional development opportunities will include but are not limited to:

- Benchmark Advance Curriculum and Resources
- Decision Tree and Progress Monitoring Tools

- Digging into Progress Monitoring Data
- ELA Block Planning and Co-teaching with District staff
- Math Block Expectations, Resources, and Assessments
- Science Benchmark/Blackboard Links/IFG

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

Additional services include:

- Addition of ESOL paraprofessional to provide services to ELL learners.
- Two retired teachers have been contracted to provide an additional 30 hours of interventions per week.
- Addition of two instructional facilitators to assist in identifying students, specific learning gaps, as well as resources to target interventions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a need for additional human resources on the Leadership Team to directly support instruction and provide ongoing feedback to teachers in regards to their instructional practices.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>-By the end of 2021-2022, a minimum of 82% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the FSA English Language Arts Assessment. This is based on 2018-2019 FSA data in which 80% of students demonstrated proficiency.</p> <p>-By the end of 2021-2022, a minimum of 90% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the FSA Math Assessment. This is based on 2018-2019 FSA data in which 88% of students demonstrated proficiency.</p>
Monitoring:	This area of focus will continuously be monitored by utilizing data found on the Progress Monitoring tools which includes but is not limited to Fluency, Running/Reading Records, Reading and Writing Interim Assessments and iReady, The final desired outcome will be measured through FSA Reading and Math Assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The three evidence-based strategies for this Area of Focus are:</p> <p>Professional Development - Effect Size .62 - Ongoing learning opportunities available to teachers to invest in their teachers' growth, knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Collective Teacher Efficacy - 1.57: A group's shared belief in the conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment.</p> <p>Teacher Clarity - Effect Size .75: The process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the needs of learners (teachers.) As demonstrated by our data, there is a need to strengthen the delivery of instruction both at the Tier 1 level as well as Tiers 2 and 3.

Action Steps to Implement

Two instructional coaches were hired (ELA and Math). Instructional coaches will meet at a minimum of biweekly to collaborate and provide professional development in the areas of curriculum and instruction, instructional strategies, assessment, data analysis, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The instructional coaches will collaborate weekly with the principal in meetings that are intentionally organized, facilitated, and supported with a focus on strengthening instruction. The effectiveness of action steps will be reviewed and the action plan will be adjusted accordingly as a result of these meetings.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Instructional coaches will maximize the expertise of District level curriculum support specialists to support the needs of the school. This includes but is not limited to Benchmark Curriculum, ELA Decision Tree, Progress Monitoring, instructional block planning, and available resources.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - ELA and Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>FSA ELA data indicated learning gains of our lowest 25% are a priority area of focus. In 2019, there was a 7 percentage point decrease in the number of our bottom quartile students demonstrating learning gains. In 2021, there was an additional 5 percentage point decrease. Within this area of focus, a specific focus will be our students with disabilities.</p> <p>FSA Math data indicated learning gains of our lowest 25% are also a priority area of focus. In 2019, there was an 8 percentage point decrease in the number of our bottom quartile students demonstrating learning gains. In 2021, there was an additional 41% decrease. Within this area of focus, a specific focus will be our students with disabilities.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 21-22 school year, a minimum of 75% of the lowest quartile students will be successful in making learning gains as demonstrated on the FSA ELA and Math Assessment.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will continuously be monitored through weekly progress monitoring. Also utilized will be data found on the Progress Monitoring tools The final desired outcome will be measured through Math Assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The two evidence-based strategies that will be the focus of our plan of improvement are:</p> <p>Response to intervention (RTI) - Effect Size 1.07: Systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of their learning. RTI seeks to prevent academic failure through early intervention, targeted, intensive instruction, and frequent progress measurement.</p> <p>Teacher Clarity - Effect Size .75: The process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the needs of learners (teachers.) As demonstrated by our data, there is a need to strengthen the delivery of instruction for students in our bottom quartile.

Action Steps to Implement

Planning days will be made available to all teachers to progress monitoring data to identify specific areas of deficit in order to develop instructional groups, interventions, and review resources to support intervention efforts. Ongoing monitoring of progress monitoring data will be used to determine the effectiveness of interventions and adjustments will be made as warranted.

Person Responsible Andrea Tirabassi (andrea.tirabassi@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Collaborative planning sessions with school leadership, including data chats and bi-weekly check-ins with instructional facilitators.

Person Responsible Andrea Tirabassi (andrea.tirabassi@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Contracted services will provide interventions at each grade level for 30 minutes daily for students in the lowest quartile.

Person Responsible Andrea Tirabassi (andrea.tirabassi@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Professional development on high yield strategies to meet the needs of all students with a specific focus on the lowest quartile students. Training includes but is not limited to Benchmark Advance/ELA Curriculum, Decision Tree and Progress Monitoring, and instructional block planning.

Person Responsible Andrea Tirabassi (andrea.tirabassi@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Weekly ESE CPT's in addition to grade-level CPT's to identify the causes of students not making adequate growth, brainstorm solutions, evaluate and monitor progress, and adjust as needed.

Person Responsible Jennifer Kahler (jennifer.kahler@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: There is a need for continuous growth in the delivery of instruction at the Tier 1 level.

Measurable Outcome:

-By the end of 2021-2022, a minimum of 82% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the FSA English Language Arts Assessment. This is based on 2018-2019 FSA data in which 80% of students demonstrated proficiency; and 2020-2021 data in which 73% of students demonstrated proficiency.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will continuously be monitored by utilizing data found on the Progress Monitoring tools which includes but is not limited to Fluency, Running/Reading Records, Reading and Writing Interim Assessments and iReady, The final desired outcome will be measured through FSA Reading and Math Assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

The three evidence-based strategies that will be the focus of our plan of improvement are:

Collective Teacher Efficacy - 1.57: A group's shared belief in the conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teacher Clarity - Effect Size .75: The process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.

Professional Development - Effect Size .62 - Ongoing learning opportunities available to teachers to invest in their teachers' growth, knowledge and skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the needs of learners. As demonstrated by our data, there is a need to strengthen the delivery of instruction both at the Tier 1 level.

Action Steps to Implement

Lakeview's Literacy Leadership Team will meet regularly to analyze data, participate in ongoing professional dialogue and make instructional decisions based on the school's needs. The Literacy Leadership Team will also identify resources and professional development needs to support literacy goals.

Person Responsible

Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

A Literacy Walkthrough Tool will be utilized by administration to monitor implementation of and ensure compliance with, the reading plan. This includes weekly ELA walkthroughs with a focus on Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, Comprehension and Writing. Information and data collected through the walkthrough tool will be shared with the Literacy Leadership Team.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Kahler (jennifer.kahler@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The Read At Home Plan will be distributed, introduced, and promoted to increase support for families to engage in literacy activities and reading at home.

Person Responsible Jennifer Kahler (jennifer.kahler@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ELA Instructional coach will maximize the expertise of District level curriculum support specialists to support the needs of the school. This includes but is not limited to Benchmark Curriculum, ELA Decision Tree, Progress Monitoring, instructional block planning, and available resources.

Person Responsible Andrea Tirabassi (andrea.tirabassi@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ELA instructional coach will meet at a minimum of biweekly to collaborate and provide professional development in the areas of curriculum and instruction, instructional strategies, assessment, data analysis, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance of Students Below 90% During the 2019-2020 school year, 14 students were identified as having Moderate Chronic or Severe Chronic attendance status. This was a 10 student reduction from the prior year. In 2020-2021, Lakeview had 5 students identified as having Severe Chronic attendance and 43 students identified as having Moderate Chronic attendance status. 2020-2021's attendance data was clearly impacted by the COVID pandemic.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the 2019-2020 data, our intended outcome is to reduce the number of students identified as having Moderate or Severe Chronic status by 10%, bringing the number of students to 12 or less.
Monitoring:	Attendance data for those students identified as having a severe or moderate attendance status will be reviewed bi-weekly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The two evidence-based strategies that will be the focus of our plan of improvement are: Parental Involvement - Effect Size .5: Parental involvement is a combination of commitment and active participation with the school community. Teacher/Student Relationships - Effect Size .72: Teachers who establish a personal and caring relationship and foster positive social interactions within their classrooms meet their students' needs for relatedness (or social connection to school).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the needs of learners.

Action Steps to Implement

School-wide campaign promoting good attendance will be ongoing throughout the year. The campaign will encompass good attendance habits messaging and weekly segments on the Lakeview News Network promoting good attendance habits.

Person Responsible Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Monthly meetings with the school-based attendance task force consisting of Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, applicable teachers, and other related support staff as warranted. Meetings will include a review of specific school data as well as school-wide data.

Person Responsible Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

SWST meetings will be held on a weekly basis. Students with attendance concern, their interventions, and progress monitoring data will be discussed as needed.

Person Responsible Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Communications will be made with families whose students were designated as severe or moderately chronic. Communications will include good attendance habits as well as offer support to address the needs of our students.

Person Responsible Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The Guidance Counselor or School Social Worker will conduct weekly check-ins with students who demonstrate deficiencies in the area of attendance.

Person Responsible Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Students who were designated Severe Chronic will be assigned a mentor. Mentors will serve as a person they can check in with frequently, progress monitor attendance together and promote positive attendance habits.

Person Responsible Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Students who were designated Severe Chronic will be assigned a mentor. Mentors will serve as a person they can check in with frequently, progress monitor attendance together and promote positive attendance habits.

Person Responsible Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Achievement - Science
Description and Rationale:	FSA Science data indicates the number of students scoring at a proficiency level in Science is a priority area of focus. There was a 15 percentage point decrease in the number of our students demonstrating proficiency in 2021. In 2019, there was a 10 percentage point decrease in proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	-By the end of 2021-2022, a minimum of 83% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the FSA Science Assessment. This is based on 2018-2019 FSA data in which 81% of students demonstrated proficiency; and 2020-2021 data in which 66% of students demonstrated proficiency.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will continuously be monitored through progress monitoring. Also utilized will be data from the Science Benchmark Assessments. The final desired outcome will be measured through the FSA Science Assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The three evidence-based strategies for this Area of Focus are:</p> <p>Professional Development - Effect Size .62 - Ongoing learning opportunities available to teachers to invest in their teachers' growth, knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Collective Teacher Efficacy - 1.57: A group's shared belief in the conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment.</p> <p>Teacher Clarity - Effect Size .75: The process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the needs of learners. As demonstrated by our data, there is a need to strengthen the delivery of instruction in Science. .

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coach was hired (Math and Science). Instructional coach will meet at a minimum of biweekly to collaborate and provide professional development in the areas of curriculum and instruction, instructional strategies, assessment, data analysis, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Ali Binswanger (ali.binswanger@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Instructional coaches will maximize the expertise of District level curriculum support specialists to support the needs of the school. This includes but is not limited to available resources, instructional strategies, and progress monitoring,

Person Responsible Ali Binswanger (ali.binswanger@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Instructional coach will have a specific focus on new teachers, providing frequent collaboration and coaching. This will include planning, observations with reflection, and frequent collaboration.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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 reviewed ongoingly by the administration, the Positive Behavior Support Team, SWST, and CARE. Additionally, the Threat Assessment Team will meet on an as-needed basis as well as monthly to make sure we are identifying and providing services and support to students as warranted.

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.

Lakeview Elementary School promotes a positive culture and environment through a variety of programs and endeavors. Lakeview Elementary School is a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) model school that provides a positive framework that affects student outcomes every day. It is a way to support students and staff in setting expectations, acknowledging desired behaviors, and celebrating success on a monthly basis

Lakeview Elementary School provides Parent and Family Engagement materials and training designed to provide assistance to parents and families in understanding challenging State academic standards, State and local academic assessments, how to monitor a child's progress, and how to work with educators to improve the achievement of their children at convenient, flexible times such as mornings and evenings as well as at-home/attendance zone visits to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Additionally, technology including social media and virtual meeting programs (Zoom, Teams, etc) promotes participation and awareness through live and recorded sessions to accommodate varying schedules. In addition, the district and school website contains links, resources, and materials, such as parent guides, study guides, practice assessments, student performance materials, and training to help parents and families work with their children to improve achievement.

Parents and families are members of Lakeview's School Advisory Council to formulate suggestions and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education of their children. Lakeview responds to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible as evidenced by meeting minutes and notes. If this school-wide improvement plan is not satisfactory to parents, parents/families are encouraged to submit such comments in writing so that the school can document and submit any parents' comments.

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

Lisa Wheatley, Principal
Jennifer Kahler, Assistant Principal

Lauren Piatt, Guidance Counselor and PBIS Coordinator
PBIS Members include: Sabrina Charlotte (Staff), Jen Shelly (Staff), Rachael Foord (Staff/Parent), Anna Atkins (Staff), Denise Dellelis (Staff), Tamara Marken (Staff), Kim Miles (Staff), Jennifer Kahler (PBS), Andrea Tirabassi (Staff), Stacey Holmes (Staff)

Mavis Seger, Teacher and SAC Chairperson
SAC members include: Lisa Wheatley (Staff), Rhonda Pichevin (Staff), Courtnee O'Shea (Staff), Laura Hayes (Staff), Linda Long (Staff), Khizran Usman (Staff), Kelle Hoskins (Staff), Yaneth Vegara (Classified), Ashley Cote (Parent), April Franciosi (Parent), Allison Gehlot (Parent), Tanya Kutchara (Parent), Eliza Miller (Parent), Pamela Minore (Parent), Bridgette Rees (Parent), Stacey Smith (Parent), Sue Hlohinec (Business/Community), Natalie Nikas (Business/Community)

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00