

Clay County Schools

Lake Asbury 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Lake Asbury Elementary School

2901 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://lae.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Heather Roche

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	42%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Lake Asbury Elementary School

2901 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://lae.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	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

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.

Our mission is to increase the academic achievement of all students. Lake Asbury Elementary, working collaboratively with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Our teachers will provide rigorous and relevant learning opportunities for each child to experience academic success within a safe and inviting environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Asbury Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for personal success in a global and a diverse society.

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
Outman, Tiffany	Principal	The principal is responsible for ensuring quality instruction in the school, ensuring facilities and operations are in order, recruit and retain highly effective faculty and staff, building the culture of the school and ensuring that financial rules, procedures, and regulations are followed with fidelity.
Mclver, Melanie	Assistant Principal	
Love, Angela	Other	
Rockwell, Amber	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Heather Roche

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.*

5

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

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

880

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

3

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

5

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	117	128	98	135	113	112	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	853
Attendance below 90 percent	16	9	10	11	9	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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

Friday 10/8/2021

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	96	82	118	91	109	140	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	766
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	96	82	118	91	109	140	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	766
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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				64%	65%	57%	61%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	62%	58%	51%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	54%	53%	35%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				71%	70%	63%	74%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	66%	62%	71%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	56%	51%	50%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				68%	65%	53%	76%	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	73%	68%	5%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	62%	4%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2021					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	71%	5%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	69%	9%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2021					
	2019	65%	70%	-5%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	67%	63%	4%	53%	14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Lake Asbury Elementary used IREADY for the 20-21 Progress Monitoring for ELA & Math FSA for Grade 5 Science

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			49%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			40%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			52%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			41%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			48%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			43%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			42%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			49%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			31%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			42%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			70%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			27%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			44%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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	45	27	44	47	35	44				
BLK	44			51	54						
HSP	70	67		66	65		67				
MUL	68	64		68	57						
WHT	65	58	47	71	60	41	74				
FRL	55	56	42	56	51	44	74				
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	40	42	30	49	49	40	48				
BLK	44	55	56	50	50	35	20				
HSP	74	76		67	63		79				
MUL	64	56		64	56						
WHT	66	60	37	75	65	49	74				
FRL	59	56	41	62	56	37	62				
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	43	43	34	50	62	44	62				
BLK	33	28	21	51	53	31	71				
HSP	49	52	40	73	61	33	73				
MUL	78	73		87	75						
WHT	64	53	37	77	75	58	76				
FRL	55	49	37	69	67	46	75				

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	58
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	50
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	67
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	64
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	59
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?

The trends across grade levels that have emerged are within our lowest quartile in reading and math. We struggle to meet their needs and close their gaps.

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

Based on our data review, ELA and Math lower quartile are areas of improvement for us. 44% of our scholars in the lower quartile made gains in ELA, while 43% of our lower quartile scholars made gains in math. We saw the biggest decrease in math gains across the board going from 74% to 46%.

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

There was a notable variance between the scholars who were learning online last year and those who were brick and mortar. Teachers struggled to provide high quality instruction due to technical difficulties and lack of participation from at home learners. This year we are all brick and mortar, therefore, expect an increase in all content areas.

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

Our 6th grade math proficiency showed the most improvement rising to 78% proficient.

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

Our teachers used an accelerated math book with all scholars last year. The pace and rigor of this curriculum along with our teachers' high quality instruction were contributing factors to this improvement.

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

LAE only has brick and mortar classes this year. Our focus will be on scholar academic ownership by focusing on clearly communicating learning targets and success criteria for every lesson, checking for understanding, and being intentional about the questions we are asking scholars to grapple with.

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.

Our professional development this year will be focused on clearly communicating learning targets and success criteria, checking for understanding of those learning targets, and how to respond when scholars struggle. We will also have professional learning around how to intentionally plan for rigorous questions. We will set the focus for the month and lead teachers through the PLC process focusing on scholar work.

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

As we continue to refine our teaching practices, we will learn more about the PLC process by implementing various protocols that lead to teacher and scholar success. Keeping our focus on standards and how scholars are mastering them and what to do when they don't will ultimately lead to an increase in scholar overall proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our lower quartile learners did not show adequate growth in ELA compared to other students in their respective grade levels
Measurable Outcome:	LAE plans to achieve an increase of 5 percentage points with these scholars in the lower quartile for ELA going from 44% to 49% showing learning gains.
Monitoring:	We will use Achieve Level Set, Lexia, and teacher based assessments to monitor the progress of our lower quartile scholars.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategies that we will implement are the use of small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted materials which include SAVAAS, SIPPS, and Lexia Core 5
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our students will show improvement in the area of ELA. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include SAVAAS, SIPPS, and Lexia Core 5.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development for teachers in the area of using the curriculum to teach LAFS standards with the grade level expectation of rigor.

Professional development in the area of student academic ownership using learning targets and measurable criteria.

Person Responsible Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our lower quartile learners did not show adequate growth in mathematics compared to other students in their respective grade levels.

Measurable Outcome: LAE plans to achieve an increase of 5 percentage points with these scholars in the lower quartile for mathematics increasing from 43% to 48%.

Monitoring: We will disaggregate the iReady diagnostic data and class based assessments to monitor scholar progress throughout the year. During these data chats, we will plan for small group instruction and utilize our resources to provide intensive interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategies that we will implement are the use of small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted materials which include Eureka Math and iReady.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our lower quartile students will show improvement in mathematics. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include Eureka Math and iReady.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development for teachers in the area of using the curriculum to teach MAFS standards with the grade level expectation of rigor.

Professional development in the area of student academic ownership using learning targets and measurable criteria.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will focus on our Social Emotional Learning to reduce the number of discipline referrals for inappropriate conduct or disputes with students/school board employees.
Measurable Outcome:	We will reduce the number of referrals by 10%
Monitoring:	Administration will monitor monthly referrals and provide an area of focus for classroom walk-throughs based on reasons for the referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will incorporate the 7 Mindset lessons in every classroom and have school wide events or programs to encourage scholars to work hard and be kind always.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By increasing positive interactions with peers we will decrease the number of referrals.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Lake Asbury Elementary is not listed in the choices for elementary schools.

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.

We incorporate the 7 mindsets curriculum into our daily instruction and interactions. We recognize positive attributes and behaviors with Leader Tickets. We foster a community of "Work Hard, Be Kind." We intentionally plan our social media post to highlight our social emotional learning. We routinely celebrate scholars for reaching both academic and social emotional learning goals. These celebrations include Leader Tickets that are sent home and newsletters highlighting our work across campus with our 7 Mindsets information. We have made such progress with our Leader Tickets for scholars that they are now asking to give Leader Tickets to each other and their teachers. We host monthly Principal Pancake Breakfasts for Leader Ticket Winners, celebrate them on the LAE Friday News, recognize leaders in the front office and send pictures home to parents. These are how we build positive school culture school wide. Our teachers also incorporate various strategies in their classrooms that include positive home/school connections.

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

The Principal oversees all of the school-wide recognitions and celebrations.

Our Social Media Team plans and posts positive aspects of our school life.

Teachers and staff plan and implement various strategies in their classrooms as well as positive parent communication.

Scholars recognize each other and staff with kind notes, shout outs, and leader tickets.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00