

Clay County Schools

# Lakeside Junior High 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>10</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 Junior High School

2750 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ljh.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Dustin James**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<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)	46%
<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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (68%)
<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>	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 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>10</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 Junior High School

2750 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ljh.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

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

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

Lakeside Junior High School is dedicated to providing a safe physical environment so that each student can obtain the tools necessary to be successful in the twenty-first century. This is accomplished by establishing high positive expectations, mutual self-respect among students and staff, and community involvement to enable students to become confident, self-directed, life-long learners.

### 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
Ivey, Rodney	Principal	
James, Dustin	Assistant Principal	
Davis, Hope	Assistant Principal	
Bumpers, Sherry	Teacher, K-12	
Duchemin, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
McCorduck, Kerry	Teacher, K-12	
Hiscox, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Maly, Richard	Teacher, K-12	
Jones, Johnathan	Teacher, K-12	
Holmgren, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Hube, Shannnon	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Patterson, Lloyd	Dean	
Coffee, Tia	Teacher, ESE	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Dustin James

**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.*

4

**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.*

19

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

58

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

879

**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.**

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	479	400	0	0	0	0	879
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	58	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	49	0	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	77	0	0	0	0	157
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	19	35	0	0	0	0	54	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
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**

Thursday 9/15/2022

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350	374	0	0	0	0	724	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	7	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	40	0	0	0	0	83	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	44	0	0	0	0	81	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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

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

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350	374	0	0	0	0	724	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	7	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	40	0	0	0	0	83	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	44	0	0	0	0	81	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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

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

## 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	70%	56%	50%				71%	61%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						64%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						56%	49%	47%
Math Achievement	78%	33%	36%				78%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	66%						65%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						65%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	64%	53%				74%	66%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	59%	58%				90%	81%	72%

**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
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	74%	59%	15%	52%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	69%	62%	7%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	79%	63%	16%	54%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	48%	49%	-1%	46%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	74%	64%	10%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	80%	12%	71%	21%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	65%	27%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%

## 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	40	36	45	50	43	50	71	52		
ELL	58	45		58	60						
ASN	78	53		83	72				100		
BLK	47	51	53	58	66	60	52	86	50		
HSP	66	53	36	70	60	41	74	90	85		
MUL	70	65	57	71	64	40	82	100	50		
WHT	73	57	40	83	68	65	87	92	73		
FRL	58	51	43	66	59	56	73	88	59		
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	28	43	45	38	43	43	28	63	46		
ELL	47	64		60	71						

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
ASN	100	69		82	56		82		86		
BLK	40	42	20	44	36	33	52	65	43		
HSP	65	66	50	62	58	59	58	79	59		
MUL	60	68	50	79	60	80	77	81	83		
WHT	73	62	53	81	60	59	75	90	75		
FRL	58	53	41	64	50	54	60	74	60		
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	34	53	55	42	54	58	32	69	74		
ELL	44	53		29	41		42				
ASN	71	44		81	87				60		
BLK	62	61	46	65	63	63	48	92	70		
HSP	65	68	56	76	61	71	73	90	88		
MUL	71	46	50	78	71	63	75	86	87		
WHT	74	67	60	80	65	65	78	91	84		
FRL	62	63	56	70	63	66	60	85	78		

### 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	69
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	618
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
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	67
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	71
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	61
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?

The data trends show that we have made great improvements in the areas of Science, Social Studies, and math learning gains.

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

Lowest quartile percentiles for ELA and math show the greatest area of need for improvement.

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

The contributing factors include students who have prior deficits in all academic areas, with strong tier one instruction with a focus on small group instruction/remediation. Professional learning communities will be used to create common assessments to monitor data to adjust instruction.

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

Science and Social Students Achievement showed the most growth of improvement.

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

We used a strong focus on our professional learning communities to promote collaboration through departments with district leadership coaching in addition to school based administrative support.

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

Strong tier one instruction with a focus on small group instruction/remediation. Professional learning communities will be used to create common assessments to monitor data to adjust instruction. High expectations for all students will help focus an increase on accelerated learning.

#### 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 will host monthly whole group faculty professional development as well as weekly professional learning communities to provide teachers and leader opportunities to partner together to accelerate

learning. Data will be specifically reviewed to discuss, identify, and support bottom quartile students by administrators.

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

Weekly classroom walkthroughs and leadership collaboration will be held to promote a continuous improvement and partnership with faculty for sustainability of academic success.

### 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 campus wide expectations

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Through student, parent, and faculty/staff survey showed a critical need for communication of school wide expectations.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

From Fall of 2022 to Summer of 2023 student referrals will decrease by 15% based off of new school wide expectations taught through Gator Time Talks, posting of expectation matrix throughout campus, and classroom expectation reminders.

##### Monitoring:

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

Monthly review of data of discipline through Synergy SIS by the PBIS team.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hope Davis (hope.davis@myoneclay.net)

##### Evidence-based Strategy:

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

PBIS team state and district monitored program with representation from all school wide departments.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Survey taken by all stakeholders.

##### 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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

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

Data driven instruction via collaborative practices are key to improving student achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

During the 2022-23 school year student achievement will increase to 62% in each core content subject area based on FAST progress monitoring results from baseline to end of year data collection.

**Monitoring:**

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

Weekly PLC meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rodney Ivey (rodney.ivey@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

FAST progress monitoring

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Collaborative Planning through departmental Professional Learning Communities

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

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

In review of data it was determined that a need for instructional leadership would be critical to improve student achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of 2022-23 school, student achievement will improve to 62% in all core content areas according to the FAST progress monitoring from baseline to end of year assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

FAST progress monitoring

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rodney Ivey (rodney.ivey@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Weekly classroom walkthroughs and partnership with administration and faculty will provide effective feedback to improve student achievement.

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

District level monitoring of administrative walkthroughs is expected of all administrators and monitored via a electronic program with the expectation that you inspect what you expect.

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**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**

N/A

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

N/A

**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)**

N/A

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

N/A

**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.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**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?

N/A

**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?

N/A

**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**

N/A

## 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.

LJH will be working with multiple resources such as; PBIS Rewards and the 7 Mindsets program to help decrease the overall amount of behavior referrals in all subgroups, and increase a positive learning environment across campus. The PBIS team will meet monthly to review behavioral data and determine a rewards system. The PBIS and leadership team has developed a school wide #gatorsCHOMP theme with the CHOMP acronym: Courteous, Honorable, On Task, Mindful, and Prepared that is taught across the school to all students.

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

Hope Davis  
 Rebecca Roberts  
 Amanda Sterio  
 Elizabeth Afilleje  
 Salem, Jamie  
 Mr. Jones  
 Michelle DuChemin  
 Shannon Hube  
 Melissa Matz  
 Jennifer Johnston  
 Janice Sheridan

They work collaboratively as a team meeting monthly to promote a positive culture and environment at the school by reviewing data and providing opportunities for rewards.