Lakeview Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lakeview Elementary School

7299 HAND RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/lakeview

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.

It is the mission of Lakeview Elementary School to create positive relationships and engaging academic opportunities to ensure high levels of learning for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lakeview Elementary School strives to promote a safe, positive and differentiated environment. Our dedication to innovative, individualized, lifelong learning empowers all students to achieve their personal best and confidently face the challenges of tomorrow.

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
Wheatley, Lisa	Principal	Primary Duties/Responsibilities Include: -Serves as the instructional leader of the school, which includes setting, support, and monitoring rigorous standards for teacher instruction and student achievement. -Provides and promotes a positive school climate that reflects a culture of excellence, teamwork, and collaboration among the staff, teachers, students, and families. -Ensures an orderly learning environment focused on the safety, security, and well-being of all students, staff, and visitors. -Leads leadership team that includes assistant principal, instructional facilitators, ESE liaison, and Guidance Counselor. This team meets weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted. -Leads Literacy Leadership Team that includes assistant principal, instructional facilitator, ESE liaison, Reading Recovery teacher and grade-level representatives. Lakeview's Literacy Leadership Team will meet regularly to analyze data, participate in ongoing professional dialogue and make instructional decisions based on the school's needs. The Literacy Leadership Team will also identify resources and professional development needs to support literacy goals. -Meets with and leads team leaders in facilitating instructional excellence amongst their teams. Team leaders along with instructional facilitators collaboratively facilitate the Multi-Tiered System of Support with a focus on the framework of highly impactful Tier 1 instruction, as well as targeted Tier 2 and 3 interventions.
Giddens, Michelle	Assistant Principal	-Works directly with principal to support and monitoring rigorous standards for teacher instruction and student achievement. -Provides and promotes a positive school climate that reflects a culture of excellence, teamwork, and collaboration among the staff, teachers, students, and families. -Ensures an orderly learning environment focused on the safety, security, and well-being of all students, staff, and visitors. -Member of leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted. -Serves as the LEA representative and leads ESE team in collaboration

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		with ESE liaison to ensure highly effective individualized instruction for students with IEPs.
Uhr, Amy	Other	-Member of leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted. -Serves as ESE Liaison, maintaining a working knowledge and ensures ESE meeting procedures and Individual Education Plans are meeting the needs of students and are in compliance with federal, state, and local rules and regulations regarding the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) district-level programming. -Serves as the LEA representative and leads ESE team in collaboration with the assistant principal to ensure highly effective individualized instruction for students with IEPs.
Binswanger, Ali	Math Coach	-Member of the leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted. -Serves as the Instructional Math Coach promoting active learning in the classroom using board-adopted curriculum and other appropriate learning resources and activities. Provide support in coaching and modeling effective teaching strategies within the classroom by planning and executing well-designed lessons and interventions. -Attends and co-facilitates Collaborative Planning teams to analyze data and trends, addressing Tier 1 instructional strategies, creating intervention groups, and planning targeted interventions to meet the needs of struggling learners.
McLoud, Amber	Instructional Coach	-Serves as the Instructional English Language Arts Coach promoting active learning in the classroom using board-adopted curriculum and other appropriate learning resources and activities. Provide support in coaching and modeling effective teaching strategies within the classroom by planning and executing well-designed lessons and interventions. -Attends and co-facilitates Collaborative Planning teams to analyze data and trends, addressing Tier 1 instructional strategies, creating

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		intervention groups, and planning targeted interventions to meet the needs of struggling learners.
McClenathen, Kristen	Reading Coach	-Serves as the Instructional English Language Arts Coach promoting active learning in the classroom using board-adopted curriculum and other appropriate learning resources and activities. Provide support in coaching and modeling effective teaching strategies within the classroom by planning and executing well-designed lessons and interventions. -Attends and co-facilitates Collaborative Planning teams to analyze data and trends, addressing Tier 1 instructional strategies, creating intervention groups, and planning targeted interventions to meet the needs of struggling learners.
Piatt, Lauren	School Counselor	-Member of the leadership team that weekly to discuss and if warranted problem-solve academic, behavioral, and procedural topics. The continuous improvement cycle is utilized to ensure that data is analyzed, critical needs are identified, evidence-based materials and strategies are appropriate, resources are maximized, progress is monitored, and adjustments are made as warranted. -Provides whole class lessons, small group, and individual counseling to help students cope effectively with personal, social, academic, and family concerns. -Collaborates with mental health counselors and other supporting agencies to provide resources and services as warranted.

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.

The SIP at Lakeview Elementary School is designed to be the primary artifact used by our school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. This "living document" is continually updated, refined and utilized to guide our work throughout the school year. These reviews occur at multiple times throughout the school year at School Advisory Council meetings, Team Leader meetings, PTO meetings, grade level team meetings, etc.

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))

Our SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement. This "living document" will be continually updated, refined and utilized to guide our work throughout the school year. These reviews occur at multiple times throughout the school year at School Advisory Council meetings, Team Leader meetings, PTO meetings, grade level team meetings, etc. Based on the feedback and input at these meetings, we as a school team, will monitor and make edits as necessary for the good of our student population and school community.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	2	15	14	16	11	15	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	4	4	2	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	8	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8
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	9	0	6	0	0	0	15

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	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) 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	1	18	13	16	9	17	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	9	3	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	9
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	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	18	13	16	9	17	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	9	3	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	9
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	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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*	77	65	53	79	66	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				75			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			42		
Math Achievement*	89	68	59	88	52	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				90			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78			35		
Science Achievement*	86	69	54	76	67	59	67		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					60	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	68	59	77			91		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	628
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	56			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	62			
MUL	90			
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	66			

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	64			
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	80			

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	88			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	73			

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	77			89			86					61
SWD	44			64			60				4	
ELL	67			71							3	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	61			70			69				5	57
MUL	86			96			89				3	
PAC												
WHT	79			92			89				4	
FRL	62			78			70				5	56

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	79	75	65	88	90	78	76					77
SWD	34	68	71	75	74	64	60					
ELL	55	71		80	86							77
AMI												
ASN												

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												
HSP	67	89	92	75	89	85	65					75
MUL	86	71		96	100							
PAC												
WHT	81	73	55	89	90	79	78					
FRL	70	81	73	80	81	71	55					

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	73	65	42	74	66	35	67					91
SWD	32	23	27	43	38		15					
ELL	61			78								91
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	64	75		66	62		59					
MUL	76			86								
PAC												
WHT	76	61	36	76	64	39	67					
FRL	57	59	27	65	66	50	53					

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	79%	67%	12%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	67%	10%	58%	19%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	74%	61%	13%	50%	24%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	89%	70%	19%	59%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	96%	70%	26%	61%	35%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	66%	22%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2023 - Spring	82%	67%	15%	51%	31%

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.

The data component indicating the need for the most focus this coming school year is the following area; English Language Arts (ELA)- Achievement. For this area, ELA achievement was 77% which was a drop by 2% from the previous year. Specifically our grade 3 ELA achievement was the lowest among grades 3-5 at 74%. One fact that may have contributed to this lower performance is related to the new FAST statewide assessment.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the year prior is;
English Language Arts (ELA)- Achievement. For this area, ELA achievement was 77% which was a drop by 2% from 79% the previous year. One factor that may have contributed to this decline is the new FAST state assessment in which all students participated this past school year.

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.

We are currently awaiting on data from the state to determine this information.

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

The data component showing the most improvement thus far is our Science Achievement data which increased from 76% to 82% by 6%. As a school community we were focused on Science instruction in the classroom as well as our Science Lab teacher on the specials wheel collaborating with classroom teachers to bring Science alive for all students.

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

One area of concern in reviewing our EWS data is the area of attendance of our students. This is an area we continue to focus on as a school and have put forth efforts to improve this area. We have many team members who connect with the families of these students and form relationships with these families to bridge the gap from home to school. We are able to provide resources and supports individualized for the families to help get students to school regularly.

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

1. Building capacity in our school calling on in-house experts to lead the charge with it comes to effective educational initiatives.
2. English Language Arts Instruction & Achievement. Focused on Tier 1 efforts and differentiated instruction in the classroom.
3. Coaching

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 Small Group Instruction

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.

Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - ELA
FSA ELA data indicated learning gains of our lowest 25% are a priority area of focus. Within this area of focus, a specific focus will be our subgroup of white students who performed the lowest of all subgroups at 55%.

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, a minimum of 75% of the lowest quartile students will be successful in making learning gains as demonstrated on the F.A.S.T. ELA Assessment.

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

This area of focus will continuously be monitored through weekly progress monitoring. Also utilized will be data found on the Progress Monitoring tools. The final desired outcome will be measured through ELA Assessment
results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

The two evidence-based strategies that will be the focus of our plan of
improvement are:
Response to intervention (RTI) - Effect Size 1.07: Systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of their learning. RTI seeks to prevent academic failure through early intervention, targeted,
intensive instruction, and frequent progress measurement.
Teacher Clarity - Effect Size .75: The process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.

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

The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the needs of learners (teachers.) As demonstrated by our data, there is a need to
strengthen the delivery of instruction for students in our bottom quartile.

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.

Planning days will be made available to all teachers to progress monitoring data to identify specific areas of deficit in order to develop instructional groups, interventions, and review resources to support intervention efforts. On-going monitoring of progress monitoring data will be used to determine the effectiveness of interventions and adjustments will be made as warranted.

Person Responsible: Michelle Giddens (michelle.giddens@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

There is a need for continuous growth in the delivery of instruction at the Tier 1 level.

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

-By the end of 2023-2024, a minimum of 79% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the F.A.S.T. English Language Arts Assessment. This is based on 2022-2023 FSA data in which 77% of students demonstrated proficiency; and 2021-2022 data in which 73% of students demonstrated proficiency.

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

This area of focus will continuously be monitored by utilizing data found on the Progress Monitoring tools which includes but is not limited to Fluency, Running/Reading Records, Reading and Writing Interim Assessments and iReady, The final desired outcome will be measured through F.A.S.T. Reading Assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

The three evidence-based strategies that will be the focus of our plan of improvement are:
Collective Teacher Efficacy - 1.57: A group's shared belief in the conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment.
Teacher Clarity - Effect Size .75: The process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.
Professional Development - Effect Size .62 - Ongoing learning opportunities available to teachers to invest in their teachers' growth, knowledge and skills.

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

The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the needs of learners. As demonstrated by our data, there is a need to strengthen the delivery of instruction both at the Tier 1 level.

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.

Lakeview's Literacy Leadership Team will meet regularly to analyze data, participate in ongoing professional dialogue and make instructional decisions based on the school's needs. The Literacy Leadership Team will also identify resources and professional development needs to support literacy goals.

Person Responsible: Michelle Giddens (michelle.giddens@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: SY 2023-2024

A Literacy Walkthrough Tool will be utilized by administration to monitor implementation of and ensure compliance with, the reading plan. This includes weekly ELA walkthroughs with a focus on Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, Comprehension and Writing. Information and data collected through the walkthrough tool will be shared with the Literacy Leadership Team.

Person Responsible: Michelle Giddens (michelle.giddens@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: SY 2023-2024

ELA Instructional coach will maximize the expertise of District level curriculum support specialists to support the needs of the school. This includes but is not limited to Benchmark Curriculum, ELA Decision Tree, Progress Monitoring, instructional block planning, and available resources.

Person Responsible: Michelle Giddens (michelle.giddens@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: SY 2023-2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

Attendance of Students Below 90%
During the 2022-2023 school year, 74 students were identified as
having Moderate Chronic or Severe Chronic attendance status.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 data, our intended outcome is to reduce the
number of students identified as having Moderate or Severe Chronic
status by 10%.

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

Attendance data for those students identified as having a severe or
moderate attendance status will be reviewed bi-weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

The two evidence-based strategies that will be the focus of our plan
of improvement are:
Parental Involvement - Effect Size .5: Parental involvement is a
combination of commitment and active participation with the school
community.
Teacher/Student Relationships - Effect Size .72: Teachers who
establish a personal and caring relationship and foster positive social
interactions within their classrooms meet their students' needs for
relatedness (or social connection to school).

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

The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as
they are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet
the needs of learners.

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.

School-wide campaign promoting good attendance will be ongoing throughout the year. The campaign will encompass good attendance habits messaging and weekly segments on the Lakeview News Network promoting good attendance habits.

Person Responsible: Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: SY 2023-2024

Monthly meetings with the school-based attendance task force consisting of Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, applicable teachers, and other related support staff as warranted. Meetings will include a review of specific school data as well as school-wide data.

Person Responsible: Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

SWST meetings will be held on a weekly basis. Students with attendance concern, their interventions, and progress monitoring data will be discussed as needed.

Person Responsible: Amber McLoud (amber.mcloud@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Communications will be made with families whose students were designated as severe or moderately chronic. Communications will include good attendance habits as well as offer support to address the needs of our students.

Person Responsible: Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

The Guidance Counselor or School Social Worker will conduct weekly check-ins with students who demonstrate deficiencies in the area of attendance.

Person Responsible: Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Students who were designated Severe Chronic will be assigned a mentor. Mentors will serve as a person they can check in with frequently, progress monitor attendance together and promote positive attendance habits.

Person Responsible: Lauren Piatt (lauren.piatt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Achievement - Science
FSA Science data indicates the number of students scoring at a
proficiency level in Science continues to be an area of focus. While
there was a 6% point increase in the number of our students
demonstrating proficiency in 2022 we are hopeful to continue this trend
next school year.

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

By the end of 2023-24, a minimum of 84% of students will demonstrate
proficiency on the FSA Science Assessment. This is based on 2022-23
FSA data in which 82% of students demonstrated proficiency.

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

This area of focus will continuously be monitored through progress
monitoring. Also utilized will be data from the Science Benchmark
Assessments. The final desired outcome will be measured through the
FSA Science Assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

The three evidence-based strategies for this Area of Focus are:
Professional Development - Effect Size .62 - Ongoing learning
opportunities available to teachers to invest in their teachers' growth,
knowledge and skills.
Collective Teacher Efficacy - 1.57: A group's shared belief in the
conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action
required to produce given levels of attainment.
Teacher Clarity - Effect Size .75: The process for narrowing and
focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help
learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning
intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.

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

The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they
are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the
needs of learners. As demonstrated by our data, there is a need to
strengthen the delivery of instruction in Science.

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.

Instructional coach (Math/Science) continues to support classroom teachers. Instructional coach will meet at a minimum of biweekly to collaborate and provide professional development in the areas of curriculum and instruction, instructional strategies, assessment, data analysis, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Ali Binswanger (ali.binswanger@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Bi-weekly

Instructional coaches will maximize the expertise of District level curriculum support specialists to support the needs of the school. This includes but is not limited to available resources, instructional strategies, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Ali Binswanger (ali.binswanger@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Instructional coach will have a specific focus on new teachers, providing frequent collaboration and coaching. This will include planning, observations with reflection, and frequent collaboration.

Person Responsible: Ali Binswanger (ali.binswanger@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

There is a need for continuous growth in the delivery of instruction at the
Tier 1 level.

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

-By the end of 2023-24, a minimum of 93% of students will demonstrate
proficiency on the F.A.S.T. Math Assessment. This is based on
2022-2023 FSA data in which 91% of students demonstrated
proficiency; and 2021-2022 data in which 88% of students demonstrated
proficiency.

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

This area of focus will continuously be monitored by utilizing data found
on the Progress Monitoring tools which includes but is not limited to Fact
Fluency, Math classroom performance, Math Interim Assessments and
iReady. The final desired outcome will be measured through F.A.S.T.
Math Assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Wheatley (lisa.wheatley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

The three evidence-based strategies that will be the focus of our plan of
improvement are:
Collective Teacher Efficacy - 1.57: A group's shared belief in the
conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action
required to produce given levels of attainment.
Teacher Clarity - Effect Size .75: The process for narrowing and
focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help
learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning
intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions.
Professional Development - Effect Size .62 - Ongoing learning
opportunities available to teachers to invest in their teachers' growth,
knowledge and skills.

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

The above-mentioned evidence-based strategies were chosen as they
are high effect strategies that are targeted and proven to meet the
needs of learners. As demonstrated by our data, there is a need to
strengthen the delivery of instruction both at the Tier 1 level.

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.

Lakeview's Leadership Team will meet regularly to analyze data, participate in ongoing professional dialogue and make instructional decisions based on the school's needs. The Leadership Team will also identify resources and professional development needs to support Math goals.

Person Responsible: Michelle Giddens (michelle.giddens@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Math Instructional coach will maximize the expertise of District level curriculum support specialists to support the needs of the school. This includes but is not limited to Math curriculum, Progress Monitoring, instructional block planning, and available resources.

Person Responsible: Ali Binswanger (ali.binswanger@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly