Lakeview Fundamental Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lakeview Fundamental Elementary

2229 25TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

http://www.lakeview-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Lakeview Fundamental is to engage, educate and empower every student every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moses, Tekoa		Ensuring that academic policies and curriculum are followed, Developing and tracking benchmarks for measuring institutional success. Helping teachers maximize their teaching potential Meeting and listening to concerns of students on a regular basis Encouraging, guiding and assisting student leaders and teachers Meeting with parents and administrators on a regular basis for problem resolution Enforcing discipline when necessary Providing an atmosphere free of any bias in whichstudents can achieve their maximum potential
	Administrative Support	provide assistance and professional growth to teachers, including training and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies and best practices to improve student achievement.
Wood, Jason	Teacher, K-12	Serves as Administrator on duty in the absence of the Principal, Facilitates Safety Meetings, Interviewing

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School leadership met with teachers, staff, and a PTA representative to survey the current state of the school and provide their input in the development of the 23/24 SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement through the weekly SBLT, bi-weekly data chats, monthly leadership walks/observational rounds, and weekly planning and professional development sessions. The plan will be revised as information is gathered through the monitoring cycles.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	1	0	7	4	5	0	4	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	6	10	7	5	7	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	14	9	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	14	9	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	9	9	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	20	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	6	10	7	5	7	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	14	9	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	14	9	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	9	9	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	20	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	54	53	68	55	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				67			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			25		
Math Achievement*	59	61	59	63	51	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				52			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				23			9		
Science Achievement*	55	62	54	55	62	59	67		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	245
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	82			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	75			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			59			55					
SWD	40			20							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	73			91							2	
BLK	43			28		22					4	
HSP	82			82							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75			79			80				4	
FRL	45			40			35				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	67	44	63	52	23	55					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	81	92		94	100							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	47	50	35	42	36	18	48					
HSP	75			75								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85	74		73	51		57					
FRL	56	62	44	46	48	26	48					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	52	25	61	46	9	67					
SWD	30			10								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	88			94								
BLK	37	25		39	6		33					
HSP	60			60								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	81	64		70	64		87					
FRL	43	22		41	17		32					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	57%	2%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	58%	7%	58%	7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	53%	14%	50%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	62%	3%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	66%	1%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	60%	-5%	51%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science showed the lowest performance of 55%. The factors that contributed to these results were limited hands-on learning experiences to build science knowledge and a strong focus on science vocabulary.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA showed a decrease in performance from 68% to 64% and Mathematics showed a decrease in performance from 63% to 60%. The factors that contributed to this decline was limited lesson study and teacher clarity in the new benchmarks, limited student-centered instruction, and limited posing of purposeful questions to assess student thinking.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the area of Mathematics. The factors that contributed to this gap was a limited use of mathematics materials to deepen student understanding and posing purposeful questions to strengthen scholar discourse.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

There was not a data component that showed improvement this year, however the science performance data did remain consistent to previous years.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our current 5th grade cohort is composed of 10 scholars who scored a level 1 in Mathematics.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1.Collaborative Planning and professional development to participate in lesson study, planning purposeful questions, high yield instructional strategies, and methods to increase student engagement.

2. Bi-weekly data chats, using data and student work samples to drive instruction and plan for differentiation.

3. Leadership walks and instructional rounds to provide feedback to improve practice on strategies provided in collaborative planning and professional development.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of improving instructional practice related to student engagement was identified as a result of the 2022/2023 FAST data. Only 60% of scholars scored a 3 or above in Mathematics, 64% in ELA, and 55% in Science.

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

Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 10% from 60% to 70%.
Proficiency in ELA will increase 9% from 64% to 75%.
Proficiency in Science will increase 10% from 55% to 65%.

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

Monitored through weekly leadership walkthroughs and administrative walkthroughs
Monitored through formative assessments and student work analysis
Monitored through the use of the MTR Coaching Tool

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Use and connect mathematical representations. Effective teaching of mathematics engages students in making connections among mathematical representations to deepen understanding of mathematics concepts and procedures and as tools for problem solving.

Facilitate meaningful mathematical discourse. Effective teaching of mathematics facilitates discourse among students to build shared understanding of mathematical ideas by analyzing and comparing student approaches and arguments.

Pose purposeful questions. Effective teaching of ELA, Mathematics, and Science uses purposeful questions to assess and advance students' reasoning and sense making about important ideas and relationships.

During Science collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning, including, but not limited to common planning, materials management, and use of collaborative structures for high-level engagement tasks.

Ensure professional development is content-focused, teacher and student-focused, instructionally relevant, and actionable.

Elicit and use evidence of student thinking. Effective teaching of mathematics uses evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding and to adjust instruction continually in ways that support and extend learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The evidence-based strategies are from NCTM's landmark publication Principles to Actions, which connects research with practice. This resources offers guidance to teachers, coaches, administrators, and parents.

Classroom discussion is a method of teaching, that involves the entire class in a discussion. The teacher stops lecturing and students get together as a class to discuss an important issue. Classroom discussion allows students to improve communication skills by voicing their opinions and thoughts. Teachers also benefit from classroom discussion as it allows them to see if students have learnt the concepts that are being taught. Moreover, a classroom discussion creates an environment where everyone learns from each other.

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Employ instructional practices and routines that promote student-centered learning (Higher-Order Questioning, Pinellas Problem Solving Routine, Play-Explore-Investigate (PEI) Routine, Number Sense Making Routines, Collaborative structures, High-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback).

Person Responsible: Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

By When: January 2024

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and intervention, based on data, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark in Mathematics, ELA, and Science.

Person Responsible: Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023

Leadership Team and classroom teachers to engage in observational rounds and leadership walks.

Person Responsible: Sara Koch (kochsa@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023- March 2024

Utilize the MTR Coaching tool to provide feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible: Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

By When: March 2024

Utilize multiple forms of formative assessment and use the District Data PLC Protocol to game plan to utilize differentiated resources to inform future instruction.

Person Responsible: Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

By When: To begin by October 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Support academic growth of all learners with regards to B.E.S.T Standards and action plan for scaffolded support using collaborative structures and organizational systems.

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

Lakeview Fundamental scholars will increase attendance physically by 5% as measured by the 2023-2024 daily average attendance rate.

Lakeview Fundamental scholars will show a decrease in discipline infractions by 5% monthly as measured by FOCUS discipline data and discipline infraction data.

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

Bi-weekly CST Meetings
SBLT
Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implement and monitor for the routine use of collaborative structures and provide students opportunities to work collaboratively in activities such as Socratic Seminar, Philosophical Chairs, and Collaborative Study.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Scholar achievement increases as student engagement increases as a result of effective collaborative structures.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Implement and monitor scaffolded supports, including modifications and accommodations, for all students who are struggling with academic concepts, even at high levels.

Person Responsible: Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

By When: March 2024

Implement goal setting opportunities where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress through the year, revising their goals based on data and celebrating successes.

Person Responsible: Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

By When: November 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The process used to review school improvement funding will be based on a problem solving cycle where we research and survey to identify current needs, plan for improvement, utilize available resources, monitor, and repeat. The School based Leadership Team will monitor the progression of this cycle on a quarterly basis.