Lake Asbury Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Asbury Elementary School

2901 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://lae.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Heather Roche

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Lake Asbury Elementary School

2901 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://lae.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	42%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Heather Roche

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.*
6

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

966

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

8

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

13

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	124	135	124	128	145	133	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	930
Attendance below 90 percent	18	21	17	14	20	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	10	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	9	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	5	12	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	8	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/7/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	68%	63%	56%				64%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						61%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						43%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	75%	51%	50%				71%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	78%						63%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						45%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	69%	59%				68%	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	73%	68%	5%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	62%	4%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2022					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	76%	71%	5%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	69%	9%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2022					
	2019	65%	70%	-5%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	67%	63%	4%	53%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

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	43	56	43	56	65	55	41				
BLK	67	64	54	67	82	82	75				
HSP	53	68		60	76		75				
MUL	83	72		87	95						
WHT	69	61	52	77	77	66	71				
FRL	50	47	31	59	70	68	45				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	32	45	27	44	47	35	44				
BLK	44			51	54						
HSP	70	67		66	65		67				
MUL	68	64		68	57						
WHT	65	58	47	71	60	41	74				
FRL	55	56	42	56	51	44	74				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	40	42	30	49	49	40	48				
BLK	44	55	56	50	50	35	20				
HSP	74	76		67	63		79				
MUL	64	56		64	56						
WHT	66	60	37	75	65	49	74				
FRL	59	56	41	62	56	37	62				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
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	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	70
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	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	84
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	68
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?

Historically we have struggled with our lower quartile data regardless of the subgroup. Though we showed improvement this year, that area will remain our focus.

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

Based on the data, our ELA lower quartile growth remains our greatest area of need for improvement with 54% of our scholars making gains.

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

Even though we showed a 13 point gain in ELA lower quartile growth, this remains our lowest area. We will continue to incorporate intensive interventions for our lower quartile scholars. We continue to focus

on small group instruction based on data collected through professional learning communities as well as classroom formative assessments.

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

The area that was most improved for us is our math lower quartile with a 24 point increase.

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

This increase is due to our implementation of Eureka math curriculum from K-5 for a sustained period of time. This math curriculum focused on a true understanding of number sense and the why behind math concepts. We have implemented Eureka with fidelity for 6 years. We also have a stable teaching force who work together to understand the standards and how the fit together vertically to create a seamless math instruction for scholars.

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

We need to continue to work together in professional learning communities as we implement the new BEST Math Standards. This work with standards will support our scholars to ensure no gaps in their concept development.

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

Our school based professional learning communities are vertical in grades 3-5. 6th grade joined the 6th grade collaborative professional learning community with the district. We will continue to work as a school community on making student thinking visible, and communicating learning targets and success criteria. This will be the focus of our professional development this year.

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

Last year we were able to strengthen our Professional Learning Communities in our foundational grades as well as our vertical content teams. We will continue this work this year focused more on the common assessments as we learn the new state BEST standards.

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.**	Since this is the second year for ELA BEST standards, our focus needs to be on using the systems we have in place to improve our instructional practice with the new standards.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	LAE plans to achieve an increase of 5 percentage points with these scholars in the lower quartile for ELA going from 54% to 59% showing learning gains.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will use Achieve Level Set, Lexia, and teacher based assessments to monitor the progress of our lower quartile scholars.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The evidence-based strategies that we will implement are the use of small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted materials which include SAVAAS, SIPPS, and Lexia Core 5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our students will show improvement in the area of ELA. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include SAVAAS, SIPPS, and Lexia Core 5.

Action Steps to Implement
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.

Professional development for teachers in the area of using the curriculum to teach BEST ELA standards with the grade level expectation of rigor. Professional development in the area of student academic ownership using learning targets and measurable criteria.

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

#2. 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.	In the past several years since 2020, attendance has become optional. We are using tangible incentives as well as creating excitement for scholars surrounding learning. We are also continuing our student success team meetings to work with families to increase scholar attendance.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	In analyzing our attendance overall data from last year: 82% of scholars had 90 - 100% attendance, 15% at 80 - 89% attendance, 2% at 70-79% attendance, 6 (or less than 1%) at 60-68% attendance. This year we aim to increase our 90-100% attendance range by 3% points.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	LAE Attendance Team will meet monthly on the first Thursday of the month. The attendance team consists of the records secretary, social worker, and administrator. Input is provided by teachers via a Google Form and in the Contact Log of Synergy.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie McIver (melanie.mciver@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Creating a positive school and class environment will impact the will of students for attending school. We will use positive reinforcements, recognition, and family positive notes. This year we have also increased opportunities for activities (art club, robotics, music) which we hope to create experiences students will not want to miss.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	As shared by Attendance Works, schools can increase attendance by creating a welcoming environment that emphasizes building relationships with families and stresses the importance of going to class every day. "The key is developing a school-wide school culture that promotes a sense of safety, respect and personal responsibility, where students feel connected and know that someone notices, in a caring manner, when they missed school."

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.

Recognize when students are consistently present. Students with attendance of 95% or higher for each nine weeks will be awarded: certificate at awards ceremony, backpack attendance tags, and a thank you note for parents.

Person Responsible   Melanie McIver (melanie.mciver@myoneclay.net)

Recognize when students are not consistently present. We will follow the district flow chart for attendance. Teachers will call home after 3 absences. Notations will be made in Synergy. Attendance team will meet monthly to contact families at risk.

Person Responsible   Melanie McIver (melanie.mciver@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Since this is the first year for math BEST standards, our focus needs to be on using the systems we have in place to improve our instructional practice with the new standards.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	LAE plans to achieve an increase of 5 percentage points with these scholars in the lower quartile for math going from 70% to 75% showing learning gains.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will use iReady math and teacher based assessments to monitor the progress of our lower quartile scholars.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The evidence-based strategies that we will implement are the use of small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted materials which include iReady.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our students will show improvement in the area of math. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include Eureka and iReady math.

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.

Professional development for teachers in the area of using the curriculum to teach BEST Math standards with the grade level expectation of rigor. Professional development in the area of student academic ownership using learning targets and measurable criteria.

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

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.

School wide PBIS - Ram Riches are earned by scholars in grades 3-6 when they show they are working hard and being kind. They have an opportunity to "purchase" tangible and non tangible items from our Ram Riches cart biweekly. Non tangible items are positive phone calls home, read to a kindergartner, co-host the school news program, 15 minutes with a resource teacher, bring a stuffy to school, etc.
Additionally, K-2 will utilize Leader Tickets to recognize positive actions of students that represent work hard, be kind lessons taught in class. Students will have opportunities to visit the classroom treasure box.

Family Engagement Activities - Student-led Open House, monthly school newsletters, Dads take your child to school, character parade, semester awards assemblies, Veteran's Day concert for 3rd grade, Christmas under the stars for K-2, Spring Fling, Honor Roll Picnic, Project based learning, principal pancakes are just a few of the ways we connect with families.

7 mindset lessons, every month students from each classroom vote on a classmate who exemplifies the character mindset of the month and that student is invited to Principal Pancake breakfast to celebrate his/her classroom leadership.

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

Classroom Teachers - creating an engaging classroom environment, positive communication with parents, create a cohesive collaborative classroom community.
Resource teachers - providing multiple outlets for scholars to shine, explore outside interests,

Administrators - teacher support, scholar support, positive parent communication, community outreach, business partners,

Guidance - scholar support of life skills

Classroom Assistants - supporting teachers and scholars with disabilities to work to their fullest potential while participating in the collaborative classroom community