

Pinellas County Schools

Lakeview Fundamental Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 27 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 28 |

Lakeview Fundamental Elementary

2229 25TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

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

Demographics

Principal: Tijuana Baker

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 38% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (67%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | NOT IN DA |
| ESSA Status | |
| * 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 Pinellas 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.

Part 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

Develop lifelong learners who are successful and productive members of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Baker, Tijuana | Principal | Academic Instructional and Operational Leader |
| Altman-Wood, Kari | Guidance Counselor | |
| Panico, Debra | Teacher, K-12 | Kindergarten Teacher |
| Matthews, Clarissa | Teacher, K-12 | First Grade Teacher |
| Flint, Jessica | Instructional Coach | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/12/2019, Tijuana Baker

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 38% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (67%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | NOT IN DA |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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 | 54 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 47 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 315 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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

Tuesday 7/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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 | 52 | 53 | 52 | 53 | 61 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 336 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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 | 52 | 53 | 52 | 53 | 61 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 336 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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 | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 67% | 54% | 57% | 67% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | 59% | 58% | 51% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 32% | 54% | 53% | 34% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 66% | 61% | 63% | 70% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | 61% | 62% | 48% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | 48% | 51% | 31% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 72% | 53% | 53% | 71% | 57% | 55% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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 |
| 03 | 2019 | 67% | 56% | 11% | 58% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 53% | 9% | 57% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 67% | 56% | 11% | 58% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 51% | 17% | 56% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 66% | 54% | 12% | 56% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 50% | 20% | 55% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 54% | 62% | -8% | 62% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 62% | 10% | 62% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 72% | 64% | 8% | 64% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 62% | 11% | 62% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 72% | 60% | 12% | 60% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 61% | 5% | 61% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 72% | 54% | 18% | 53% | 19% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 57% | 14% | 55% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 25 | 18 | | 20 | 64 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 85 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 59 | 47 | 45 | 52 | 33 | 57 | | | | |
| HSP | 75 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 67 | | 80 | 80 | | 81 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 48 | 32 | 52 | 54 | 33 | 62 | | | | |

| 2018 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 44 | 46 | 50 | 25 | 31 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 40 | 24 | 50 | 38 | 33 | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 79 | | | 71 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 84 | 56 | | 87 | 55 | | 91 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 47 | 41 | 51 | 39 | 39 | 41 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 396 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 93 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 49 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 71 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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 |
| 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 | 78 |
| 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 | 47 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

* ELA and math L25 learning gains (ELA was at 31% and math at 33% overall)

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

Overall ELA learning gains for our 4th and 5th grade L25 students was 32%
 4th grade ELA L25 -- learning gain was 20% (15 students)
 5th grade ELA L25 -- learning gain was 35% (17 students)

Inconsistent administration of small group guided reading strategies identified as main contributing factor (see above list as it would apply here as well)

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

Third grade math proficiency dropped to 54% in 2019 from 72% in 2018 and was 8% lower than the district and state proficiency. This drop in proficiency may have been due in part to new instructional staff (two of the three teachers at the grade level).

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

Overall 4th and 5th Grade Math learning gains went to 67% in 2019 from 48% in 2018
 Math L25 learning gains for 4th grade was reflected at 50%
 New actions?
 Math coaching was implemented at the school, grade level teachers had collaborative and harmonious approach

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students scoring level 1 on statewide assessment
Attendance below 90%

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

1. 1. Increase ELA learning gains for L25
2. Increase 3rd Grade Math FSA Proficiency
3. Improve SBLT structure/scheduling to increase planning and effectiveness
4. Improve collaborative spirit among staff members

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>ELA L25 Learning Gains Our current level of performance is 32%, as evidenced in FSA L25 Learning Gains, which is below both the state and district performance.</p> |
| Measureable Outcome: | <p>The percent of all students identified as L25 making learning gains will increase from 32% to 50%, as measured by MAP Winter growth data and Spring FSA.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion and writing with feedback after diagnosing lost learning and putting every student on a fast track to mastery.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Core instruction is not adequately accelerating achievement for all learners. There has been a 3 year down trend in learning gains with L25 students. 2016/17 47%, 2017/18 34% and 2018/19 32%</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase effectiveness of core instruction which will allow Teachers to effectively move students to mastery appropriately targeting differentiated instructional supports.
2. Ensuring that ample and additional time is given to read and write appropriate grade level text and apply foundation skills, with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.
2. Front and Back end scaffolding of text and tasks to meet student needs will be implemented.
3. Jan Richardson implemented as designed by providing embedded professional development and monitoring with feedback from administration.
4. A variety of small group strategies will be using during core instructional and intervention time to allow students the opportunity to access and engage with grade level texts.
5. PLC and SBLT data will be used to support area of focus.
6. Maximize gifted days to allow for additional opportunities to meet the differentiated needs of all learners.

Person Responsible Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

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

ESSA Students with Disabilities Proficiency
Our ESSA ESE current status is 32%

**Measureable
Outcome:**

Our ESSA goal for the 2020/21 school year will increase to 51%

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Meet student needs by using front and back end scaffolding maintain appropriate exposure to grade level content with an emphasis on ELA.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

The downward trend of ESE students making learning gains requires intense modifications of scaffolding strategies and professional development opportunities at our school to support ESE students with reading texts that are supposedly too hard for them.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increased planning with the ESE VE Resource teacher and general education content 4th and 5th Grade teachers will be incorporated into our Professional Learning Plan.
2. Inclusive scheduling to the maximum extent possible
3. Ensure that ESE staff participate in High Quality IEP Writing
4. Ensure that ESE curriculum supports are research based interventions. (Seeing Stars) is used after accessing training.
5. Seek out assessments training for teachers and to pin point deficits in foundational skills.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Use of Front-end scaffolding strategies:

- Prehighlighting text for some learners so that when they reread independently, they can focus on the essential information
- Eliminating the need for students to copy information—and if something is needed (such as a definition of vocabulary), providing it on the handout or other student materials

Use of Back -end scaffolding strategies:

- “hint cards” that help students get “unstuck” so they can get the gist—these might be placed on the chalkboard tray, for example, and students would take them only if they are super-stuck
- Encouraging/enabling students to annotate the text, or—if they can’t write directly on the text—providing sticky notes or placing texts inside plastic sleeves (GoodReader is an app that allows students to mark up text on an Ipad. Adobe Reader works on a wide variety of electronic platforms)

Person Responsible Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

- Supplying sentence starters so all students can participate in focused discussion
- Placing students in heterogeneous groups to discuss the text and answer text-dependent questions
- Providing task cards and anchor charts so that expectations are consistently available
- Highlighting key words in task directions

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Math Proficiency Our level of proficiency at the third grade level for 2019 was 52%, as evidenced by the FSA Math scores. This is a decrease from a level of 72% proficiency on the 2018 FSA and lower than state and district averages |
| Measureable Outcome: | The percent of third grade students identified as not proficient in math will increase from to 52 to 70%+, as measured by FSA Math. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Core math instruction is not adequately accelerating achievement for all learners. Further, the 3rd Grade performance was 8% lower than the state and district. An emphasis will be placed on effective instruction and monitoring of grades 3-5. |

Action Steps to Implement

- Facilitate mathematics-focused, consistent and sustained professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLCs. Empower mathematics teacher leaders to facilitate alongside administrators.
- Schedule and facilitate ongoing mathematics unit planning sessions by grade level, using district-provided resources and protocol. Utilize prerequisite and differentiated resources, just in time and based on diagnosed need.
- Provide feedback both in- and outside the Marzano framework to all mathematics teachers a minimum of once every two weeks. Incorporate positive sticky notes, face to face meetings, and open-ended questioning.
- Empower mathematics teacher leaders to create and sustain a culture of feedback and openness, including ongoing teacher to teacher feedback, learning walks, etc. For example, using the Coached Observation Protocol.

Person Responsible

Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

- Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, Number Routines, and other standards-aligned resources. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video.
- Utilize multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction and allow students to represent and share their thinking in multiple ways. Use student work to guide analysis of student learning in grade level PLCs.

- Ensure feedback, professional development, and PLCs align with the Key Shifts in Mathematics [Focus, Coherence, Rigor] and promote strong alignment between standard, target, and task.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

1. Our current level of performance is 72% proficient, as evidenced in 2018-2019 Science Assessment.
2. We expect our performance level to be 80% by 2020-2021.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because of lack of proficiency of students in Grades 3 & 4 NGSSS.
4. If the Fall and Winter Diagnostic data is intentionally utilized for remediation of 3rd & 4th grade NGSSS, the problem would be reduced.

Measureable Outcome: The percent of 5th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 72% to 80%, as measured by 2020-2021 Science Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.
2. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
3. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If staff differentiates data to close the gap of 3rd and 4th grade NGSSS, then science proficiency will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and includes appropriate grade-level utilization of science labs in alignment with the Standards.
2. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.
3. Ensure students take diagnostic assessment in August and utilize item analysis strategies to identify lowest 3rd and 4th grade standards for Life, Physical, Earth and NOS to support planning and differentiation for students.
4. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

- Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, Number Routines, and other standards-aligned resources. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of

classroom video.

- Utilize multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction and allow students to represent and share their thinking in multiple ways. Use student work to guide analysis of student learning in grade level PLCs.
- Ensure feedback, professional development, and PLCs align with the Key Shifts in Mathematics [Focus, Coherence, Rigor] and promote strong alignment between standard, target, and task.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

5. Develop, implement and monitor science lab schedule for all students in grades 1-5.
6. Vertical articulation PLC after Fall Diagnostic data between 5th grade and 3rd & 4th grades regarding NGSSS deficit trends.

7. Conduct and implement a 5th grade standards review plan based on data from the 3rd and 4th grade Review Diagnostic Assessment and adjust based on the Review Mid-Year Diagnostic Assessment.

8. Utilize diagnostic data to identify instructional resources to support the ongoing review and expansion of

learning with an emphasis on informational text and academic vocabulary.

9. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning inclusive of the "Confirming the Learning" portion of the instructional model and student conferencing opportunities.

10. Administer 3rd & 4th grade unit assessments and use data to add to 5th Grade Review Plan.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

11. 4th grade administers Mid-Year Diagnostic Test before the end of the 2020-2021 school year to help 5th grade teachers identify 3rd and 4th grade NGSSS deficit trends from summer slide.

12. Science SIP Committee will engage families in a Science Night to showcase NOS NGSSS and get families ready for SSA on the the 3rd cycle optional science assessments.

13. Teachers will utilize the 60 Science Power Words with families and students to increase academic vocabulary.

14. All grade levels will d

15. Administration monitors teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.

16. Intentionally engage students in academic gaming with a focus on 4th grade life science.

17. Utilize Newsela articles to support 4th grade life science concepts embedded in ELA.

18. Utilizing the continuity science guide resources to differentiate instruction.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#5. Other specifically relating to Conditions for Learning

Area of Focus Conditions for Learning
Description and Rationale: Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 9 referrals for the year and 457 behavior infractions. We expect our performance level to be 3 referrals and 225 behavior infractions by May 2021.

Measurable Outcome: The number of all students receiving a behavior infraction will decrease from 457 to 225, as measured by the number of referrals written for the 20/21 School Year..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Expectations and rules are developed and effective procedures for dealing with discipline are established using a comprehensive school wide behavior plan and weekly infraction tracking system by ethnicity, gender etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies and actions are based on research and evidence-based nationally recognized programs (PBIS and Restorative Practices). The specific strategies and actions within our SIP were selected to match our school-specific needs based on our review of infraction data utilizing an equity problem-solving process.

Action Steps to Implement

During summer and preschool week, the SBLT team will hold focus groups with staff, student, and family to review and revise the 3-5 Tier 1

Expectations/Guidelines for Success to ensure that they are positively stated and apply to ALL students and ALL staff and are responsive to COVID-19.

- Prior to the first day of school with students, the PBIS Coordinator will use the Tier 1 Walkthrough Tool to ensure signage reflecting revised Guidelines for Success (expectations) are posted in common areas.

- During the first quarter, all staff will be trained in how to develop lesson plans to teach and re-teach classroom rules and procedures. Staff will review expectations and rules at least once per week with all students during Restorative Circle time.

Person Responsible Kari Altman-Wood (altmank@pcsb.org)

- Principal will distribute behavioral curriculum lesson plans to teach common area expectations from the behavior matrix that use a variety of teaching strategies. SBLT will conduct walkthroughs during the first 10 days of school to monitor delivery of these lesson plans.
- The Restorative Practices trainer will hold monthly 20 and out sessions during planning periods on classroom management including appropriate use of preventative and proactive surface management as well as minor and major corrective feedback that is delivered in culturally responsive ways.
- During the summer and preschool, the SBLT team will collaborate to develop written documentation of policies, procedures, and clearly defined problem behaviors that emphasize prevention, instruction, and restorative approaches. The team will create and share a flow chart of behaviors that

are staff managed and which are office managed and warrant an office referral or behavior call.

Person Responsible Kari Altman-Wood (altmank@pcsb.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Attendance Our current attendance rate is 96.2%. We expect our performance level to be 99.5% by May 2021 |
| Measureable Outcome: | The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 8% to 4%, as measured by Attendance Data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Increasing the rigor and high levels of engagement in classrooms the problem would be reduced by more students wanting to attend school. correct |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff.
2. Asset map the attendance resources, interventions and incentives at our school to support increased attendance for each Tier.
3. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions.
4. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance.
5. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a bi-weekly basis.
6. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly basis.
7. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Family and Community Engagemnt Partnerships with families and the community are an integral part of creating a positive school climate and assuring high academic achievement for students.

Measureable Outcome: Increase the number of family engagement nights to include a focus on curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Continue improvement and efforts to build relationships with families and the community are needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training for families logging volunteer hours
2. Contact local businesses to partner with the school to provide volunteers and possible funding
3. Hold a volunteer appreciation event in person or virtually.
4. Set up a pick up point for volunteer activities
5. Curriculum nights (Literacy, Science etc) are incorporated into our monthly PTA Meetings. (Virtual first quarter due to COVID19 restrictions)
6. Set up community mentor partnerships with local community centers and volunteer groups.
7. Develop a virtual calendar for parents to engage with our school utilizing multiple platforms.
8. Promote the Parent Guardian Connection support group by using PeachJar.

Person Responsible Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#8. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Healthy Schools Increase healthy habits of all students. Go back to include status |
| Measureable Outcome: | Percent of all students participating in all activities to increase healthy habits will increase from 70%-85% as measured by the healthy schools assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Educators realize that a child's physical and emotional , social and mental health directly affects behaviors and learning. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD in the area of cafeteria, classroom, before school, after school and PTA related activities
2. Continue integration opportunities using the school garden.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#9. Other specifically relating to Gifted

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of every student.

Measureable Outcome: Monitor number of students in the high performing upper right quadrant increase significantly each cycle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide intentional differentiation for all gifted learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research has shown that when teachers differentiate they are better able to meet the needs of gifted learners and provide opportunities for growth.

Action Steps to Implement

- Teachers intentionally plan for differentiation (using MAP or FSA data) for gifted learners and administrators monitor and provide feedback
- Teachers/Staff obtain the gifted micro-credential and/or the gifted endorsement so that they can better differentiate for gifted learners
- Cluster group gifted and talented students so that the process of differentiating is more effective for gifted learners
- Pre-test gifted students in order to better differentiate and meet their needs
- Allow gifted students to utilize “curriculum compacting” as a means for differentiation and/or scaffolding
- Pace learning for gifted learners in response to students’ individual needs
- Differentiate for gifted learners through adapting content, thinking skills, resources, and/or objectives
- Teachers attend professional development on “differentiation for gifted learners”
- Administrators recommend that Deliberate Practice Plans incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of differentiating for gifted and talented learners

Person Responsible Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#10. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Equity System Change
 As a result of equity-centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, we will develop an equity goal to build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations within the school improvement area of equity mindset shift.
 Our current level of performance is 52% Black/African American made a learning gain in Math compared to 80% white students as evidenced in Math FSA 2019. The problem/gap is occurring because there is a need for a mindset shift of teachers and staff in order to adopt and implement equitable practices to fidelity. If mindset shift would occur, the gap in achievement will close by 15%.

Measureable Outcome: To address the mindset shift for the adoption of equitable practice, we will participate in whole school equity-centered professional development. Our current data illustrates that our current level of performance is 52% Black/African American made a learning gain in Math compared to 80% white students, as evidenced by Math FSA 2019. The issue may be impacted by strengthening culturally relevant practices through targeted, sustained professional development. We will measure progress by recording the number of teachers who attend PD. We will measure mid-term outcomes by examining changes in teacher practice using a CRT classroom walk through tool and report the change in rate of observable CRT practices. We will measure long-term student outcomes by examining learning gains in Math for Black/African American students with the goal of reducing the achievement gap by 15%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Equity Consensogram protocol was used to identify Equitable practices (equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching, restorative practices etc.) as the focus strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy was identifies as a result of analysis ISM data feedback, Infraction Ethnicity Data and of the response by teachers to the Data Walk/ Core Beliefs protocol.

Action Steps to Implement

Attend "The Culturally Relevant Classroom" 3 hr PD on site
 Use AVID CRT Classroom Audit and self-reflection to support classroom practices and student outcomes.
 Attend Restorative Practice PD
 Continue to monitor infraction data by ethnicity weekly by teacher

Person Responsible Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#11. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Bridging the Gap Our current level of performance is 45.4% of our black students scored a level 3 or above, as evidenced in 2018-2019 FSA ELA. |
| Measureable Outcome: | The percent of black 5th students scoring level 3 and above on the 2020-21 FSA ELA will increase from 45.4% to 60%, as measured by 2020-21 ELA FSA scores.. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Develop a school-wide understanding and honoring culturally defined beliefs, needs, styles and behaviors of the students, families, and communities we serve. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Every school-based expert (liaison, champion, trainer) serves as an ambassador and supports that the academic, social-emotional and behavioral needs of each and every student are known and met. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure that at least 50% of teachers are trained by May 2021 in AVID CRT.
2. Monitor Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies through formal and informal observations.
3. Equity based PLC/ SBLT
4. Equity embedded PD

Person Responsible Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Communication with our school community and stakeholders is part of what makes Lakeview to know as the Little School with Big Heart. We celebrate students and staff successes by using a school wide newsletter all stakeholders. Monthly SAC, PTA, Mid-Year Updates are used to provide academic, safety and fiscal updates to all stakeholders. Lakeview is engaged in several community partnerships with the Sanderlin Neighborhood Resource Center to provide standards based after care tutoring for L25 ELA and Math students. A recent partnership with the Men of Yesterday, Today and the Future has led to mentor matches for male L25 students in need of a positive adult for social emotional support. Lakeview Fundamental will continue to engage all stakeholders during the COVID 19 Pandemic using various platforms to support families who will attend virtually or traditionally.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Conditions for Learning | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | \$0.00 |
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools | \$0.00 |
| 9 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Gifted | \$0.00 |
| 10 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity | \$0.00 |
| 11 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement) | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |