

Pinellas County Schools

# Lakewood Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Lakewood Elementary School

4151 6TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33705

<http://www.lakewood-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Renee Nellenbach**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (56%)<br>2018-19: F (30%)<br>2017-18: F (23%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Table of Contents

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Lakewood Elementary School

4151 6TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33705

<http://www.lakewood-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 89%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       |         | F       | F       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.**

The mission of Lakewood Elementary school (LES) is to provide each student with a diverse, rigorous, and standards-based education to reach their academic goals for college, career and life.

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

Lakewood Elementary's vision is 100% student success.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name               | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Nellenbach, Renee  | Principal           | The Principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Position is responsible for the total operational management of the school and instructional monitoring.   |
| Berg, Charmion     | Assistant Principal | This position is second only to the Principal in the administration of the school and serves as liaison between principal and other school personnel. This administrator assumes any duties assigned by the Principal and is fully responsible for the school program in the absence of the Principal.   |
| Metts, Lisa        | Science Coach       | Science:<br>To provide assistance and professional growth to teachers, including training and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies and best practices to improve student achievement.  |
| Olsen, Melissa     | Instructional Coach | MTSS/RTI:<br>Student Achievement: To provide assistance and professional growth to teachers, including training and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies and best practices to improve student achievement.<br>Response to Intervention: To facilitate the implementation of the problem solving process with the school-based team and all school staff |
| Richardson, Ashley | Instructional Coach | Coaching Early Literacy: Reading PreK-1<br>To provide assistance and professional growth to teachers, including training and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies and best practices to improve student achievement in early literacy and writing.   |
| Morales, Ruth      | Reading Coach       | Reading 2nd-5th & Writing K-5:<br>To provide assistance and professional growth to teachers, including training and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies and best practices to improve student achievement.  |
| Webster, Sara      | Math Coach          | Math:<br>To provide assistance and professional growth to teachers, including training and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies and best practices to improve student achievement.   |
| Araujo, Natalie    | Behavior Specialist | Behavior:<br>Establishes principles of behavior change procedures with basic understanding of applied behavior analysis.<br>Conducts and facilitates Functional Behavior Assessments and implements  |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------|----------------|--|
|      |                | Positive Behavior Intervention Plans. Establishes specific behavior management programs for students as needed. Consults with school personnel, parents, and others regarding behavior strategies. Functions in the areas of behavior management and crisis intervention and is responsible to the school principal. |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Renee Nellenbach

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

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

27

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

405

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

4

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

6

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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                              | 61          | 84 | 44 | 69 | 45 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 351   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 29          | 43 | 24 | 35 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 175   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 4           | 3  | 5  | 6  | 6  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 41 | 31 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 43 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 5  | 5  | 9  | 4  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 3           | 25 | 29 | 39 | 28 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 151   |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 8 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/11/2022

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                              | 60          | 45 | 59 | 52 | 41 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 311   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 29          | 17 | 15 | 24 | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 112   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 2  | 4  | 4  | 5  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 8  | 23 | 14 | 4  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 9  | 15 | 22 | 5  | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 17 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 15 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| 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 | 0           | 39 | 56 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 244   |

**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     | 3           | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**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                              | 60          | 45 | 59 | 52 | 41 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 311   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 29          | 17 | 15 | 24 | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 112   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 2  | 4  | 4  | 5  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 8  | 23 | 14 | 4  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 9  | 15 | 22 | 5  | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 17 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 15 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| 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 | 0           | 39 | 56 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 244   |

**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     | 3           | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| 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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 26%    | 55%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 20%    | 54%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 46%    |          |       |        |          |       | 36%    | 59%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 84%    |          |       |        |          |       | 43%    | 54%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 45%    | 51%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 17%    | 61%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 63%    |          |       |        |          |       | 31%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 79%    |          |       |        |          |       | 39%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 50%    | 62%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 27%    | 53%      | 53%   |

**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 |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 25%    | 56%      | -31%                       | 58%   | -33%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 16%    | 56%      | -40%                       | 58%   | -42%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -25%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 22%    | 54%      | -32%                       | 56%   | -34%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -16%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 19%    | 62%      | -43%                       | 62%   | -43%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 18%    | 64%      | -46%                       | 64%   | -46%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -19%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 16%    | 60%      | -44%                       | 60%   | -44%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -18%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 32%    | 54%      | -22%                       | 53%   | -21%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 30       | 47     |             | 40        | 47      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 26       | 48     | 88          | 41        | 63      | 83           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 20       |        |             | 70        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 27       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 24       | 45     | 87          | 45        | 63      | 81           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 47       | 90     |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 40       | 76     | 92          | 60        | 90      | 100          | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 53       |        |             | 73        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 74     | 93          | 63        | 91      | 100          | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 12       | 44     |             | 17        | 63      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 15       | 36     | 41          | 12        | 29      | 35           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       |        |             | 31        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 54       |        |             | 38        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 18       | 37     | 43          | 16        | 29      | 33           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 56  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 393 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 41  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |

| Native American Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students   |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 58  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  |     |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 45  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 44  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 57  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?**

According to 2022 FSA scores, we showed a significant number of students making learning gains in math and ELA, especially in our L25 subgroup. Additionally, we increased overall science proficiency by 9%. The data shows that our focus on interventions had a positive impact on these trends. However, proficiency in both math and ELA show an approximate 20% decrease compared to last year's scores signaling a need to revisit core instruction.

#### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Throughout the 2021-2022 school year we progress monitored using MAP and iReady data. This data represented a need to modify math instruction. Data from the FSA indicates that these modifications had a positive impact on our scores even though proficiency is still an area in need of growth. In ELA, the data from progress monitoring indicated that approximately 44% of students would be proficient; however, according to FSA data we showed a significant decrease in proficiency with 26% proficient overall. Our focus this year will be to maintain and grow the work we started in math with significant changes to Tier 1 instruction taking place in ELA.

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

Although students returned to school face to face full time, this year had a marked increase in absenteeism across all grade levels for both students and instructional staff due to lasting Covid effects. This resulted in a significant loss of instruction which played a part in student proficiency in ELA and math. Additionally, we saw an increase in direct instruction rather than high levels of student engagement through teaming. Improving intervention, fidelity, and monitoring was a focus area schoolwide for last year. Teachers worked with coaches to modify intervention, processes, and curriculum. Core instruction was maintained; however, implications from the emphasis on interventions resulted in a negative impact on overall proficiency. This year, while we will continue to improve and maintain our intervention practices, our focus has shifted to Tier 1 alignment of tasks to grade level standards across all subject areas. Additionally, teachers will be provided with professional development in standards driven learning through teaming to increase student engagement and decrease time spent in direct instruction.

#### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The data components that showed the most improvement according to 2022 state assessments were math learning gains in 3rd and 5th grades, math L25 learning gains in 3rd-5th grades, ELA learning gains in 3rd grade, ELA L25 learning gains in 3rd and 4th grades, and overall science proficiency.

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

With the support of coaches, we built strategic grade level standards-based interventions at the rigor of core expectations to support growth in comprehension strategies and implementation to improve overall reading and math performance across grades K-5. To monitor this work we created two walk through

forms that we used to collect data with actionable feedback for teachers to monitor trends in pacing, target task alignment, and fidelity of intervention.

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

We will continue to use data to drive instructional decisions for both curriculum and instructional delivery. Students will meet with academic mentors to discuss their learning growth so far and set attainable moving targets of growth throughout the year. Students will be given actionable feedback with accountability to ensure that they are focusing on targeted areas of improvement during core instruction with ongoing formative assessments to meet their goals. Core content in ELA, math, and science will be closely monitored to ensure that tasks are aligned to the standards at the level of rigor necessary to ensure student proficiency increases. Additionally, the use of academic teaming will support higher levels of student engagement and increase rigorous dialogue. We will continue the use of writing portfolios with writing conferences to ensure sustainable growth in writing. In conjunction with writing, students will be provided with additional time in grade level texts to increase fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. While science showed marked growth from the emphasis that was placed on hands-on lessons integrating STEM into science strategies, we will continue to integrate these practices as well as expose students to science based informative texts and virtual learning tools to further increase proficiency levels in science.

**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.**

We have networked with the district and an external operator to provide highly effective, ongoing professional development for the 2022-2023 school year. An emphasis on Arts Integration across all subject areas to incorporate various student learning styles, movement, and student choice will be conducted by the district with the support of our academic coaches. Growth in these areas will help support our goal of increased student engagement with a reduction of direct instruction. Learning Sciences International (LSI), an external operator, has partnered with our school to provide ongoing professional development and monthly walkthroughs with actionable feedback in the areas of target/task alignment and academic teaming. A focus in these areas will strengthen delivery of core instruction and also increase student engagement.

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

We will continue to provide a PreK and primary/intermediate coach in ELA to support teachers with mastery of the Science of Reading skills needed at each developmental stage of student readers. In addition, we have hired a highly effective interventionist to provide small group core instruction support to students in grades 3-5. We will incorporate the use of 4 paraprofessionals to provide targeted iSpire, iReady and phonics intervention to students across grades K-2. We will utilize 2 reading recovery teachers to provide targeted 1 on 1 support to our most struggling 1st and 2nd grade students to ensure a strong foundation with proficiency in reading prior to 3rd grade. A dedicated science coach and science lab manager will be utilized to support hands on science as well as ensure standards aligned instruction with a focus on 3rd-5th grade (Study Island). We will continue to provide math coaching to support an increase in content building for grade K-5. A focus on implementing the BEST standards for intermediate while maintaining support for primary will be a focus for the coach this year. We will continue implementing strategies for mathematical thinking, fluency, and multi-step problem solving for 3rd, 4th and 5th grades. The district has adopted new core curriculum for math. Our coach will support teachers with implementation and planning to ensure highly effective lessons for core instruction. Additionally we will continue to utilize McCarthy Math, Versatiles, J&J Math & Science Bootcamps (Extended Learning) and math intervention along with the iReady program.



### Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Equity and Diversity**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b><br><b>Description and Rationale:</b><br><b>Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</b> | <p>After reviewing attendance and behavioral referral data we concluded that an inclusive, supportive classroom environment is an essential condition for learning. Engagement and achievement thrive in a classroom culture where students' assets, interests, experiences, perspectives and cultural knowledge are valued and intentionally reflected in curriculum materials and learning experiences. When teachers have an understanding of how their interactions with students impact the equity/diversity of the classroom and school culture, specific and strategic steps can be taken to foster more positive environments, thus leading to a decrease in absenteeism and student behavioral incidents as well as an increase in student performance and autonomy.</p>           |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b><br><b>State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</b>                | <p>Students with more than 90% absenteeism will decrease by 10% by May 25th.<br/> Students with tardies and extreme tardies will decrease by 15% by May 25th.<br/> Referrals will decrease by 5% by May 25th<br/> Tier 1 calls for classroom support will decrease by 10% by May 25th</p>   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b><br><b>Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</b>  | <p>Twice a month a climate/culture data collection tool will be used to monitor trends across the school. During weekly CST meetings and Monthly Behavior Data MTSS meetings the data from the collection tool and updates on the current behavior, tardy, and absentee data will be discussed and put through the problem solving process to determine action steps that will maintain or make progress towards the goal.</p>  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>  | <p>Melissa Olsen (olsenme@pcsb.org)</p>   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b><br><b>Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented</b>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide timely, relevant professional development for equity and cultural responsiveness during pre-planning paired with an ongoing book study (Nice Racism) that will be led by Dr. Freeman-Foster.</li> <li>2. Engage families in meaningful ways that enhance their knowledge and skill of culturally relevant topics and the importance student daily attendance using our Parent Support Card and 4 quarterly parent-school connection discussion forums.</li> <li>3. Apply knowledge of culturally responsive instruction to lesson plans and learning activities in the classroom with an integration of the 6-M's (Meaning, Movement, Models, Monitoring with Feedback, Mouth (student dialogue), and Music -Dr. Mary Conage).</li> </ol> |

**for this Area of Focus.****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.****Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

1. Research supports teacher knowledge and efficacy as a key determinant of learning outcomes for students. The most effective professional development is sustained and is designed to support self-reflection and knowledge informed changes in practice. (Dana, Darling-Hammond, Fullan, Knight, etc.)
2. Authentic partnership with parents/families is correlated with higher rates of attendance, better classroom grades, lower disciplinary infractions, and higher test scores. Such partnership is created by building knowledge and capacity of parents/families to support learning at home and act as an advocate for their children's academic success. (Mapp)
3. In order to engage students and accelerate their learning, it is essential to provide asset-based instruction that builds their self-efficacy, critical thinking and reasoning while making meaningful connections to their lived experiences, passions and goals. (Ladson-Billings, Gay)

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Conduct 3-hour Equity/Diversity Training during pre-planning.

**Person Responsible** Charmion Berg (bergcha@pcsb.org)

Provide book study Nice Racism by Dr. Robin DiAngelo - With breakout assignments and talking points (Guest Facilitator Dr. Freeman-Foster)

**Person Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

Use the 6 M's Framework and the district provided Arts Integration Framework to reflect on and revise lessons for cultural responsiveness. All coaches will use this framework when planning with teachers.

**Person Responsible** Charmion Berg (bergcha@pcsb.org)

Implement Parent Support Card for increased parent engagement and increase parent participation in our Power Parent Program.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Olsen (olsenme@pcsb.org)

Implementation of FEAT (Family Engagement Action Team)

**Person Responsible** Charmion Berg (bergcha@pcsb.org)

Implementation of Quarterly Parent Connection Discussion Forums

**Person Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Although students returned to school face to face full time, this year had a marked increase in absenteeism across all grade levels for both students and instructional staff due to lasting Covid effects. This resulted in a significant loss of instruction which played a part in student proficiency in ELA and math. Additionally, we saw an increase in direct instruction rather than high levels of student engagement through teaming. Improving intervention, fidelity, and monitoring was a focus area schoolwide for last year. Teachers worked with coaches to modify intervention, processes, and curriculum. Core instruction was maintained; however, implications from the emphasis on interventions resulted in a negative impact on overall proficiency. This year, while we will continue to improve and maintain our intervention practices, our focus has shifted to Tier 1 alignment of tasks to grade level standards across all subject areas. Additionally, teachers will be provided with professional development in creating standards driven lessons with tasks aligned to the content and rigor level of the B.E.S.T standards.

**Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

As measured by the 2022-2023 State FAST Assessments:  
 Proficiency in Science will increase 10% (from 50% to 60%) by May 2023  
 Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 25% (from 26% to 51%) by May 2023  
 Learning Gains for ELA will increase 14% (from 46% to 60%) by May 2023  
 Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 15% (from 45% to 60%) by May 2023  
 Learning Gains in Math will increase 12% (from 63% to 75%) by May 2023

**Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

We will utilize various data points to monitor this area of focus including Renaissance Star, iReady, common assessments, and formative assessments. This data will be analyzed regularly with the classroom teacher and administrative/coaching team to determine next steps to meet the needs of all students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Melissa Olsen (olsenme@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

Implementation of Learning Sciences International Target Task Alignment training. Ongoing monitoring of classroom instruction with actionable feedback to ensure instructional implementation with fidelity of the strategies and the district core curriculum.

**implemented  
for this Area  
of Focus.**

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:  
Explain the  
rationale for  
selecting  
this specific  
strategy.  
Describe the  
resources/  
criteria used  
for selecting  
this  
strategy.**

In partnership with LSI we will receive a Faculty Coach for 1 day of 6-hr PD during Pre-planning and 4 visits (once a month for the first semester) to ensure implementation and sustainability.

- Additional services with this partnership include
  - Support of leadership development, instructional and support professional development, curriculum coaching support, and feedback reviews.
  - Review the SIP for effectiveness at providing students with the necessary supports and accommodations.
  - Provide technical assistance on the use of progress monitoring and standards monitoring tools.

### **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide professional development on Target Task Alignment during pre-school and periodically throughout the year on school-based PD days. Additionally, provide content embedded professional development for the core curriculum areas of ELA, Math, and Science during coach-led PLC's.

**Person Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

Utilize strategic resources to supplement the core in all 3 content areas:

- a. MakerSpace cart and associated materials for implementation of STEM enrichment opportunities and virtual learning supports using Study Island. During the extended day learning program J&J bootcamp materials will also be used.
- b. implement Reading Recovery for 1st grade and 2nd grades.
- c. Implement enrichment math classes (3-5) and build math teams to engage in school and district competitions (4-5).
- d. Develop and implement a mathematics incentive program for K-5 to encourage number sense and fact fluency.
- e. Incorporate and monitor the use of the 7 MTR practices into guided planning and as a look for during walk-throughs
- f. Incorporate enhanced vocabulary integration specifically in ELA, but also through Science and Math through writing portfolios, vocabulary notebooks, Arts Integration techniques, and interactive vocabulary web walls.

**Person Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

Administration Team, coaches, and lead teachers will coach all teachers in implementing the Technique Tools for Target Task Alignment from the LSI partnership across all content areas.

**Person Responsible** Charmion Berg (bergcha@pcsb.org)

Teachers, coaches, and administrators will utilize various assessment data (iReady -Math/ELA, ISPIRE, Khan Academy, Renaissance Star, Study Island, classroom formative assessments) along with ongoing

data from LSI's standards tracker to group students, deliver interventions, and plan rigorous lessons that are differentiated to meet student needs and monitor student improvement.

**Person Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

Purchase materials and supplies for whole- and small-group implementation of core curriculum and interventions.

a. Nemours (K), iReady (K-5), and ISPIRE (1-5), Road to the Code, as Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for identified students.

**Person Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</b> | Data collected from Lakewood's 21-22 school year walk through forms showed a marked decrease in the amount of student-led learning, student dialogue, and independent practice. The percentage of teacher directed learning and teacher centered dialogue increased 20% from the prior school year. This change in focus negatively impacted our students' performance on the state assessment and limited the opportunity for students to engage in critical thinking and rigorous tasks with peers. Recognizing that students only retain up to 20% of what they hear and only up to 50% of what they see and hear, we need to make a shift in our instruction to incorporate student engagement through academic teaming. Through academic teaming students discuss learning with others (retaining 70% of the learning) and teacher others (retaining 95% of the learning). While we will work to build knowledge, use, and structure of aligned tasks to the B.E.S.T. standards, our second critical area of focus will be concentrated in high levels of student engagement with rigorous tasks conducted using the academic teaming model of teaching and learning. To best meet this area of focus, teachers will be provided with professional development in standards driven learning through teaming to increase student engagement and decrease time spent in direct instruction. |
|--|--|

**Measurable Outcome:**  
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

As measured by the 2022-2023 State FAST Assessments:  
 Proficiency in Science will increase 10% (from 50% to 60%) by May 2023  
 Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 25% (from 26% to 51%) by May 2023  
 Learning Gains for ELA will increase 14% (from 46% to 60%) by May 2023  
 Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 15% (from 45% to 60%) by May 2023  
 Learning Gains in Math will increase 12% (from 63% to 75%) by May 2023

**Monitoring:**  
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will utilize various data points to monitor this area of focus including Renaissance Star, iReady, common assessments, and formative assessments. This data will be analyzed regularly with the classroom teacher and administrative/coaching team to determine next steps to meet the needs of all students. Additionally, we will conduct weekly walk-throughs and collect data using the LSI walkthrough tool and the district provided iObservation tool to capture trend data aligned to student engagement and provide teachers with specific feedback for growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
Describe the evidence-based

Implementation of Learning Sciences International Academic Teaming training. Ongoing monitoring of classroom instruction with actionable feedback to ensure instructional implementation of the district core curriculum with fidelity and incorporation of student engagement strategies.



**strategy  
being  
implemented  
for this Area  
of Focus.**

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:  
Explain the  
rationale for  
selecting  
this specific  
strategy.  
Describe the  
resources/  
criteria used  
for selecting  
this  
strategy.**

In partnership with LSI we will receive a Faculty Coach for 1 day of 6-hr PD during Pre-planning and 4 visits (once a month for the first semester) to ensure implementation and sustainability.

- Additional services with this partnership include
  - Support of leadership development, instructional and support professional development, curriculum coaching support, and feedback reviews.
  - Review the SIP for effectiveness at providing students with the necessary supports and accommodations.
  - Provide technical assistance on the use of progress monitoring, standards monitoring tools, and academic teaming protocols.

### **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide professional development on Academic Teaming during pre-school and periodically throughout the year on school-based PD days. Additionally provide content embedded professional development for the core curriculum areas of ELA, Math, and Science during coach-led PLC's.

**Person  
Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

Utilize strategic resources to supplement the core in all 3 content areas:

- a. Maker Space cart and associated materials for implementation of STEM enrichment opportunities and virtual learning supports using Study Island. During the extended day learning program J&J boot camp materials will also be used.
- b. Implement enrichment math classes (3-5) and build math teams to engage in school and district competitions (4-5).
- c. Develop and implement a mathematics incentive program for K-5 to encourage number sense and fact fluency.
- d. Incorporate and monitor the use of the 7 MTR practices into guided planning and as a look for during walk-throughs
- e. Incorporate enhanced vocabulary integration specifically in ELA, but also through Science and Math through writing portfolios, vocabulary notebooks, Arts Integration techniques, and interactive vocabulary web walls
- f. Incorporate the use of Academic Teaming Discussion Cards and conversation starters across all content areas.

**Person  
Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

Administration Team, coaches, and lead teachers will coach all teachers in implementing the Technique Tools for Academic Teaming from the LSI partnership across all content areas.

**Person  
Responsible** Charmion Berg (bergcha@pcsb.org)



Teachers, coaches, and administrators will utilize various assessment data (iReady -Math/ELA, ISPIRE, Khan Academy, Renaissance Star, Cambium, Study Island, classroom formative assessments) along with ongoing data from LSI's standards tracker to group students, deliver interventions, and plan rigorous lessons that are differentiated to meet student needs and monitor student improvement.

**Person Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

Purchase materials, supplies, and personnel for whole- and small-group implementation of core curriculum and interventions to support Academic Teaming.

- a. Nemours (K), iReady (K-5), and ISPIRE (1-5), Road to the Code, as Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for identified students
- b. Primary and Intermediate ELA Interventionist

**Person Responsible** Renee Nellenbach (nellenbachr@pcsb.org)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to formative assessment data 58% of K, 46% of our 1st grade students, and 25% of our 2nd grade students were proficient in ELA. This year, while we will continue to improve and maintain our intervention practices, our focus has shifted to Tier 1 alignment of tasks to grade level standards across all subject areas. Teachers will be provided with professional development in standards driven learning through teaming to increase student engagement and decrease time spent in direct instruction. We will continue to use data to drive instructional decisions for both curriculum and instructional delivery. Students will meet with academic mentors to discuss their learning growth so far and set attainable moving targets of growth throughout the year. Students will be given actionable feedback with accountability to ensure that they are focusing on targeted areas of improvement during core instruction

with ongoing formative assessments to meet their goals. Core content in ELA will be closely monitored to ensure that tasks are aligned to the standards at the level of rigor necessary to ensure student proficiency increases. Additionally, the use of academic teaming will support higher levels of student engagement and increase rigorous dialogue. We will continue the use of writing portfolios with writing conferences to ensure sustainable growth in writing. In conjunction with writing, students will be provided with additional time in grade level texts to increase fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

### **Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

According to the 2022 FSA, 25% of our 3rd grade students, 31% of our 4th grade students, and 23% of our 5th grade students were proficient in ELA. This year, while we will continue to improve and maintain our intervention practices, our focus has shifted to Tier 1 alignment of tasks to grade level standards across all subject areas. Teachers will be provided with professional development in standards driven learning through teaming to increase student engagement and decrease time spent in direct instruction. We will continue to use data to drive instructional decisions for both curriculum and instructional delivery. Students will meet with academic mentors to discuss their learning growth so far and set attainable moving targets of growth throughout the year. Students will be given actionable feedback with accountability to ensure that they are focusing on targeted areas of improvement during core instruction with ongoing formative assessments to meet their goals. Core content in ELA will be closely monitored to ensure that tasks are aligned to the standards at the level of rigor necessary to ensure student proficiency increases. Additionally, the use of academic teaming will support higher levels of student engagement and increase rigorous dialogue. We will continue the use of writing portfolios with writing conferences to ensure sustainable growth in writing. In conjunction with writing, students will be provided with additional time in grade level texts to increase fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

### **Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### **Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year 50% of our K-2nd grade students will be proficient in ELA according to the state assessment.

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year 50% of our 3rd-5th grade students will be proficient in ELA according to the state assessment.

### **Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Common (Renaissance Star) and formative assessment data (iReady/classroom data) will be analyzed weekly by the classroom teachers and administrative/coaching team. This data will be used to determine

gaps in learning and used to drive further instructions. Instructional decisions will be made to ensure every student receives strong core and individualized instruction.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Morales, Ruth, moralesru@pcsb.org

#### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We will be using the Lastinger Center for Learning Flamingo Literacy program. This program provides professional development to teachers to help them develop specialized skills and knowledge needed to provide effective reading instruction. It is based on the Science of Reading and prepares teachers to effectively teach reading, diagnose reading issues, and intervene appropriately using research based strategies.

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Lastinger Center for Learning Flamingo Literacy program is an evidence based program that prepares teachers to provide highly effective literacy instruction, diagnose reading issues, and intervene effectively.

#### **Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring    |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Literacy Coaching-ELA coaches will provide coaching to classroom teachers and interventionists regularly. Coaches will meet with teachers weekly to analyze data and determine appropriate next steps to ensure academic growth of all students.              | Morales, Ruth,<br>moralesru@pcsb.org |
| Assessment-Students will take the progress monitoring state assessments 3 times per year (Renaissance Star). The data will be analyzed with the classroom teachers and administrative/coaching team to determine next steps to meet individual student needs. | Morales, Ruth,<br>moralesru@pcsb.org |
| Professional Learning-Teachers will participate in LSI professional development with a focus on target/task alignment and student teaming in order to increase student engagement while decreasing the amount of time spent in direct instruction.            | Morales, Ruth,<br>moralesru@pcsb.org |

### 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

#### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our school values the overall wellness development of each child and encourages a strong parent/community-school partnership. In order to foster positive relationships between all stakeholders we have developed monthly activities at the school that highlight student strengths, encourage parent participation, and showcase academic and social-emotional growth. Each year we provide a wrap-around-services expo. This year the expo will take place in October to provide parents with access to the various organizations available in the community to support family needs. During the pandemic and subsequent years we learned to adjust all activities to ensure enhanced virtual options for parents and the community to make connections to the school through recorded presentations, virtual platforms, and drive through/drive-in events. We will continue many of these practices as our way of work to ensure that all stakeholders continue to have a variety of options for staying connected and informed. A key element of promoting student wellness and enhancing a positive culture during learning this year is our school-wide use of flexible seating options which engage students with various learning needs and reducing disruptions to learning. Students in grades PreK-5 have access to various seat options for whole class instruction as well as independent and group work.

This year we will continue to offer small group tours for local agencies and community organizations that will showcase the efforts in place to support student social/emotional and academic growth as well as discuss various barriers and needs that could be addressed through their invaluable partnerships that provide manpower and financial support for our school community. Our school will also incorporate and promote positive parent and school interactions through the use of the parent support card and our Power Parent initiative.

Our newly organized Family Engagement Action Team will monitor the effectiveness of all family engagement activities and seek feedback from parents on suggestions for improvement and next steps. Additionally, we will continue offering virtual elements and flexible time options for our initiatives/events so parents can access events and meetings they are unable to participate in face to face or due to conflicts in their work schedule.

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

Our FEAT team will be the primary engine for connecting community stakeholders with teachers and programs at the school. Some of the stakeholders include area churches, fine arts organizations, the local hospital, community garden programs, teachers, students, parents and other outreach organizations. Each organization supports the school through the use of volunteers, materials, supplies, visiting instructors in the visual and performing arts, collaboration with community resource agencies, and local programs for enrichment in our after school programs.