

Clay County Schools

# Lakeside 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>7</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>

# Lakeside Elementary School

2752 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://les.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Dawn Wolfe**

Start Date for this Principal: 12/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (62%) 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (63%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* 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 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](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>7</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>

## Lakeside Elementary School

2752 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://les.oneclay.net>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Lakeside's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

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

Lakeside Elementary School exists to prepare life -long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace in acquiring applicable life skills.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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
Wolfe, Dawn	Principal	The principal's duties include working collaboratively with stakeholders to ensure students are receiving high levels of instruction. Responsibilities also include overseeing the school's leadership team, serving as the instructional leader of the school, and providing professional development to staff based on data and needs. Communicating with stakeholders, maintaining the budget, and other operational functions of the school.
Fowler, Christy	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responsible for tracking and implementing safety drills, Responding to student discipline issues, and other operational functions of the school.
Dotson, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Halifko, Lucille	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade team leader
Thomas, Kristal	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade team leader
Corless, Bryan	Teacher, K-12	4th grade Team Leader
Mercer, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	5th grade Team Leader
Perry, Chad	Teacher, K-12	Resource Team Leader
Davis, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	6th grade Team Leader
Calciano, Beth	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Leader
Jernigan, Kelly	Instructional Media	Instructional Media Teacher
Knotts, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	1st grade Team Leader

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Saturday 12/1/2018, Dawn Wolfe

**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.*



**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.*

9

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

57

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

812

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

3

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

8

### 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	122	113	100	119	109	95	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	776
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	7	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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 9/26/2022

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

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

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

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

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## 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	64%	63%	56%				72%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						75%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						58%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	69%	51%	50%				77%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	73%						81%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						71%	56%	51%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	53%	69%	59%				62%	65%	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	70%	68%	2%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	64%	11%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
06	2022					
	2019	68%	64%	4%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

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	69%	71%	-2%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	89%	70%	19%	55%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	63%	-5%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

### 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	29	54	55	46	61	54	9				
ELL	21			29							
BLK	40	38	38	54	68	58					
HSP	58	67		59	67	67	44				
MUL	72	68		66	82		83				
WHT	69	66	52	76	73	52	52				
FRL	54	48	40	58	67	63	41				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	31	46	48	38	52	52	15				
ELL	70	75		55	67						
BLK	42	56	40	44	56	45	20				
HSP	66	63		60	64		47				
MUL	79	50		65	33						
WHT	72	68	71	72	70	72	62				
FRL	56	63	58	53	64	58	37				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	58	45	45	74	70	13				
ELL	46			46	70						
ASN	82	50		82	90						

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
BLK	57	61	31	60	62	53	31				
HSP	63	74	42	75	86	82	50				
MUL	80	81		93	94						
WHT	75	78	69	79	83	73	70				
FRL	64	72	56	74	81	76	58				

### 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)	ATSI
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	23
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	24
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	49
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	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	74
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	63
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	53
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?**

There continues to be a need for Lakeside to focus on the categories of SWD and ELL across all grade levels in Reading and Math. 48% of our tested ELL students scored a Level 1 in the area of ELA. 47% of our SWD population scored Level 1 in ELA. There will need to be a more intentional planning and implementation process when it comes to providing for the students in both of these subgroups. We will need to identify the specific learning challenges these students have and provide targeted interventions so that they can be academically successful and make the necessary learning gains.

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

A continued focus in the area of Reading needs to occur. Progress monitoring data shows that our SWD and ELL populations are making minimum learning gains from the start of the year to the end. State assessment data shows that our bottom quartile students are also not making substantial learning gains. State assessment data also shows that we need to focus on 3rd-grade ELA proficiency rates. We dropped from 63% proficient to 56% proficiency.

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

Covid Learning loss continues to play into the achievement of many students. Many students are coming in with learning gaps due to online learning and school closure. Gains were made in many areas but some students continued to struggle. Our third-grade students were one of the groups that had lots of gaps due to the previously mentioned circumstances. Teachers have a variety of new resources that are being used to address learning gaps and lack of exposure, especially in the area of reading. Systematic and explicit reading instruction is one of the ways that will improve the proficiency rates in the area of Reading. More intentional monitoring and tracking of students will also be key to early identification and remediation. Lakeside's ELL population has grown tremendously. Support and monitoring of this group of students have been increased.

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

State assessment data showed an increase in proficiency in Math. Proficiency percentages went from 67% to 69%. Math Learning Gains were another area of growth, proficiency rose from 66% to 73%. Science proficiency also rose from 52% to 53%.

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

A new focus on problem-solving will be used when identifying students who are struggling academically in order to identify specific deficiencies and targeted interventions. The administration will continue to provide feedback from walkthroughs to the teachers that will occur on a regular basis. Teachers will continue to use supplemental reading materials to help provide targeted instruction in the area of reading.

### **Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the ELA FSA data from the 21-22 school year, one area of focus will be the ELA Learning gains of the bottom quartile and overall learning gains of students 4-6th grade.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

FSA data shows that the overall percentage of students with learning gains in the area of ELA was 63%. The goal is to increase this percentage to 66%. For the bottom quartile students, the data shows that only 53% demonstrated learning gains. The goal will be to increase this to 60%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including SAVVAS assessments, Lexia Core 5, and classroom performance. Teachers will use PLC time to determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

The bottom quartile students have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction. Evidence-based supplemental materials have been purchased to use with students along with the SAVVAS Reading series. There will be more of a focus placed on the identification of the specific reading deficiency the student has and matching a specific intervention to remediate that deficiency.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

School-wide data and the bottom quartile report were used to determine these strategies.

**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.

Intentional small group instruction

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

PLC - to analyze data and identification of struggling students.

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

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the ELA FSA data from the 21-22 school year, one area of focus will be the ELA proficiency rates of our ELL students in 3rd-6th grade.

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

FSA data shows that the overall percentage of ELL students scoring Level 1 in the area of ELA was 43%. The goal is to decrease this percentage to 35%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including SAVVAS assessments, Lexia Core 5, Imagine Learning, and classroom performance. Teachers will use PLC time to determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration. Frequent check-ins with the ESOL Assistant will also be completed to monitor progress of the ELL students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:****Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

The ELL students have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction. Evidence-based supplemental materials have been purchased to use with students along with the Reading series. Identified ELL students will also have access to Imagine Learning and the ESOL Assistant.

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

School-wide data and the ELL report were used to determine these strategies.

**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.

Small group instruction

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

Support from the ESOL Assistant and use of a computer-based program called Imagine Learning.

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

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the ELA FSA data from the 21-22 school year, one area of focus will be the ELA proficiency levels and overall learning gains of the SWD students in 3-6th grade.

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

FSA data shows that the overall percentage of SWD scoring Level 1 in the area of ELA was 48%. The goal is to decrease this percentage to 40 %.

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

This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including SAVVAS assessments, Lexia Core 5, IEP goal progress, and classroom performance. Teachers will use PLC time to determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

The SWD have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction. They will also receive support/instruction from their grade level ESE teacher. Evidence-based supplemental materials have been purchased to use with students along with the SAVVAS Reading series. There will be more of a focus placed on the identification of the specific reading deficiency the student has and matching a specific intensive instruction to remediate that deficiency.

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

School-wide data and the bottom quartile report were used to determine these strategies.

**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.

Targeted small group instruction provided by the classroom teacher and ESE teacher.

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

Monitoring of IEP goals

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

**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to attendance****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

It is important that a positive learning environment be established at Lakeside Elementary. Students are more likely to perform at a higher academic level when they are in an environment that is supportive of their needs. Students must be at school to be successful academically. It is important that they come to school and be on time every day.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The goal is to achieve a daily attendance rate of 95%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Attendance will be monitored daily through the use of Synergy reports. Attendance reports will be run weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christy Fowler (christy.fowler@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Monitoring of attendance is an important step in creating successful students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students need to be at school every day in order to master grade-level standards and acquire the necessary skills to be successful at their grade level.

**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.

Teachers will make contact with parents/guardians after the 3rd consecutive day a student is out.

**Person Responsible**

Christy Fowler (christy.fowler@myoneclay.net)

Weekly attendance meetings will be held with Assistant Principal, school social worker, school counselor, and record's secretary to review attendance reports. Letters will be sent home in conjunction with district guidelines.

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]



## **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.**

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

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

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