Lake St. George Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake St. George Elementary School

2855 COUNTY ROAD 95, Palm Harbor, FL 34684

https://sites.google.com/a/sites.pcsb.org/lsg-es/home

Demographics

Principal: Monica Wolcott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2018-19 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)	41%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C
	2016-17: A
	2015-16: A
	2014-15: A
	2013-14: A
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
ESSA Status	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.](http://www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Preparing tomorrow's leaders today.

Provide the school's vision statement

The Vision of Lake St. George Elementary school is 100% student engagement and success 100% of the time.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Wolcott, Monika	Principal
Principal	
Whitaker, Stephanie	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Dyer, Terri	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Boyd, Corey	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
McGann, Jill	Psychologist
Psychologist	
Munns, Janine	SAC Member
SAC Member	
Ogle, Cathy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Shaffer, Jenna	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	

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	81	97	93	102	99	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	15	17	15	27	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
36

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 6/12/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	17	15	27	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	65%	54%	57%	64%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	59%	58%	50%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	54%	53%	43%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	76%	61%	63%	73%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	69%	61%	62%	53%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	48%	51%	33%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	64%	53%	53%	53%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	81 (0)	97 (0)	93 (0)	102 (0)	99 (0)	110 (0)	582 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	15 ()	17 ()	15 ()	27 ()	16 ()	11 ()	101 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	9 (0)	16 (0)	27 (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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
	2018	71%	53%	18%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
	2018	59%	50%	9%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	62%	21%	62%	21%
	2018	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	64%	20%	64%	20%
	2018	72%	62%	10%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	62%	60%	2%	60%	2%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	53%	13%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
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	41	58	42	55	72	60	35				
ELL	47	69		67	80						

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
BLK	50	20		86	70						
HSP	60	57		68	69		73				
MUL	67			80							
WHT	67	66	49	76	68	40	64				
FRL	58	55	44	73	68	52	61				

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	27	37	40	40	38	25	33				
ELL	56	70		65	73						
BLK	67	58		67	58						
HSP	65	47		67	52		41				
MUL	82			64							
WHT	63	50	39	75	53	28	58				
FRL	58	46	48	66	49	35	45				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	88
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	70

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	65
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	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	61
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	59
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

Our L25 learning gains are consistently low. We are reaching students who are near grade level. However our lowest students are not increasing into the next bucket.

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

Our 4th graders entering 5th grade show low performance in reading across the grade level. They declined 7 points. This cohort is traditionally high and scores should mirror it.

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

Learning gains for L25 in ELA at 44% is the greatest issue. We had back to back maternity leave in 5th grade with 2 very strong teachers. We also wavered between Reading units of Study and the district shared ELA Modules. This may have contributed to not addressing a standard thoroughly enough.

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

5th grade Science increased from 54% to 66%. We held a whole grade level science camp twice during the year where the 5th grade teachers reviewed 3rd and 4th grade standards based on diagnostic test score. We focused on the 60 power vocabulary words and encouraged the integration of these words throughout the day, including morning work, PE, and recess. Our ELP plan for science was data driven and fluid to constantly address the most current need of the grade level and to include the students from month to month which were in need of the intervention of that month's standards. The fifth grade team also participated in specific data informed planning sessions which gave them greater understanding of standard limits and the needs of the students in relation to the content limits.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

1. The third grade to fourth grade cohort had the 27% of its students at or

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

1. L25 ELA Learning Gains
2. L25 Math Learning Gains
3. SWD
4. ELA overall
5. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA
Rationale	The rate of growth of our bottom quartile student is at 44% of students making one year's worth of growth as evidenced by the FSA. We expect our performance level to be 55% by May 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because the instruction students are receiving is not being differentiated in a way to address the individual needs of these students.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of students showing growth in the L25 will be equal to 55% by May of 2020 as demonstrated on FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction designed to meet the needs of all learners including but not limited to Marzano's high yields strategies. Identifying similarities and differences Summarizing and note taking Reinforcing effort and providing recognition Homework and practice Nonlinguistic representations Cooperative learning Setting objectives and providing feedback Generate and testing hypothesis Questions, cues, and advance organizers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement, Robert Marzano (2001) and his colleagues identify nine high-yield instructional strategies through a meta-analysis of over 100 independent studies. They determined that these nine strategies have the greatest positive affect on student achievement for all students, in all subject areas, at all grade levels.
Action Step	
Description	1. Content Professional Development working with Marzano's 9 High Yield Strategies, with a focus on differentiated instruction. 2. Analyzing walk through data and focusing on what the L25 students are working on during the ELA block. Are they working on grade level text for an extended period of time? Giving feedback to teachers regarding trends of L25 during ELA. 3. Designated PLC's that allow for teachers to collaboratively plan based on data from walkthroughs and monthly formative assessments, focusing on L25 students data trends and planning specific strategies for these students. 4. Designated Monthly vertical PLC to allow teachers to visit other classrooms with a purpose aligned to the differentiated instruction and the 9 Marzano Strategies . Empower ELA champions/cohort teacher to develop as literacy leaders (co facilitate pd sessions alongside administrators, open classrooms for

observation and feedback, coach colleagues in literacy process)

Immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate, grade-level text and apply foundational skills, with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Person Responsible	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 76%, as evidenced in the Math FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of number sense for the L25%
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of students scoring 3 or higher will increase to 80 percent as measured by the 2020 FSA. Attention will be paid intensly on L25.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@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. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This was selected because our teachers have been successful using current curriculum and adding this strategy will support moving students further in their mathematical thinking.
Action Step	
Description	1. Content Professional Development conducted a district math coach. 2. Designated PLC's that allow for teachers to collaboratively plan 3. Designated Monthly PLC to allow teachers to visit other classrooms with a purpose aligned to math best practice. 4. Implement AVID school wide with PD monthly 5. Align individual teacher's Deliberate Practice to more focused teacher needs.
Person Responsible	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	5th grade Science increased from 54% to 66%. We held a whole grade level science camp twice during the year where the 5th grade teachers reviewed 3rd and 4th grade standards based on diagnostic test score. We focused on the 60 power vocabulary words and encouraged the integration of these words throughout the day, including morning work, PE, and recess. Our ELP plan for science was data driven and fluid to constantly address the most current need of the grade level and to include the students from month to month which were in need of the intervention of that month's standards. The fifth grade team also participated in specific data informed planning sessions which gave them greater understanding of standard limits and the needs of the students in relation to the content limits.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students scoring a proficiency of 3 or above will increase to 71% as measured on the SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue to focus on the 60 power vocabulary words and encourage the integration of these words throughout the day, including morning work, PE, and recess.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In the previous year this was our focus and we gained 12 percent as measured on the SSA.

Action Step	
Description	1. Take Pretest 2. Review 3rd and 4th grade science standards 3. Hold Science camps 4. Use 60 power word vocabulary plan discussed in rationale 5. PLC's specific to science, analyzing 5th grade unit assessments and identifying low performing standards to add to review during review rotations. For all grade levels we will continue to utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science unit that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10 setting purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriated grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st-5th grade standards.
Person Responsible	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap
Rationale	After analyzing previous data sources, our black students demonstrated a proficiency rate 67% proficiency in mathematics compared to 75% proficiency demonstrated by white students as measured by FSA mathematics test.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Black students will demonstrate proficiency at a rate of 80%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure that culturally responsive teaching practices and restorative practices are implemented in each and every mathematics based classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on professional development attended and resources analyzed from these professional development sessions, it is evident that successful implementation of culturally responsive teaching strategies and restorative practices within our classrooms will result in classroom that are more responsive to the academic, social, and emotional needs of our black students.
Action Step	
Description	1 Integrate culturally responsive teaching strategies into staff meetings, PLC's, and site based professional development opportunities. 2. Monitor classrooms for implementation of culturally responsive teaching strategies through lesson plans, walk through and observational data giving feedback as necessary to implementation with fidelity. 3. Secure peer mentors if deemed appropriate. 4. 5. .
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#5	
Title	Conditions for Learning
Rationale	Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 13 referrals. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because of the need to grow a greater understanding and capacity to implement restorative practices for all staff.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students receiving discipline referrals will decrease from 13 to 5, as measured by the end of the 2020 school year profiles report.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the implementation of researched-based practices in restorative practices that communicate high expectations for each student. Support the implementation of engagement strategies the support the development of social and instructional teaching. Support the development and/or implementation of school-wide ownership of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If the implementation of Restorative Practices, SEL, and Culturally Relevant. Teaching practices is done with fidelity, the problem would be reduced to a more equitable referral risk ratio as evidenced by restorative practices research by the IIRP.

Action Step	
Description	1. Ensure more members of the teaching staff receive Restorative Practices training and ongoing professional development of Restorative strategies integrated in a multi-tiered system of supports. 2. Develop a well-defined process that integrates restorative practices across the PBIS continuum. 3. Ensure critical components of our school-wide discipline plan include restorative language. 4. Develop a clear discipline/referral process for both teachers and students to include restorative measures used by teachers and staff 5. Integrated within SBLT, regularly analyze and review data to identify progress, areas for improvement, trends, and next steps.
Person Responsible	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 89.6% attendance rate, as evidenced by our record keeping data system, Focus. The problem/gap is occurring due to the number of family events that take place as reported in Focus. 12% of our students have 10% or more absences.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will decrease our percentage of students with 10% or more absences will decrease by 6% giving us a 95% attendance rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The use of PBIS framework to change the focus of discipline for absences to reward for attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Chronic absenteeism – defined as a student missing 15 or more days per school year –affects up to 15% of school populations. These students are at greater risk of not completing their academic career.Beginning in elementary school, students missing two days of class per month end up missing about 10% of the total school year. Each absence puts them further behind their peers, especially when it comes to literacy. By third grade, learning to read becomes reading to learn. Students who read at grade level by the end of third grade are three to four times more likely to graduate high school and pursue post graduate education.

Action Step	
Description	1. Implement PBIS- making school attendance a priority. 2. Child Study Team will monitor student absenteeism. 3. Social Worker will provide support to families that have high absenteeism. 4. Student recognition during lunch/car cash incentives
Person Responsible	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	The number of parent activities offered was 20 last year and parent attendance was very good. We expect to alter some of the traditional activities to focus on academics instead of mostly family fun events.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of parent participation in school activities will increase from 40% to 60% as measured by the parent sign-in sheets at each school activity by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement school and family events in a systematic, integrated, sustained and meaningful approach that will engage parents and families, are linked to learning and are collaborative and interactive. Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Lake St. George Elementary believes that effective family engagement is grounded in partnership of shared responsibility among families, community organizations and schools and that it occurs across multiple settings and contexts in which children can learn and families can connect.

Action Step	
Description	1. Develop a community relations program that includes volunteers, businesses,parents and other agencies to increase the capacity of our school to engage with our community. 2. Actively encourage and facilitate family participation in school events by developing activities that engage students, parents and school personnel in joint activities that are tied to learning. 3. Increase awareness of education by providing academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home, helping parents build a culture of high expectations. 4. Provide multiple opportunities for families to be involved through a variety of activities at school and at home, and communicate with them regarding the various factors that promote students' academic success. 5. Create a welcoming school environment that respects and celebrates language and cultural diversity and display student work throughout the building and ensure families receive written communication in the home languages they speak, or provide translation services. 6. Regularly solicit parent feedback and input on school activities and events. Encourage parents with leadership capacity to be parent representatives on school leadership teams by making personal connections.
Person Responsible	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is just below Bronze in Alliance for Healthier Generation's Schools Program Assessment.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect our performance level to be by May Bronze 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because of lack motivation and initiative.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of 4 individuals including but not limited to: PE Teacher, classroom teacher, wellness champion, administrator, cafeteria manager, parent and student. 2. Attend district-supported professional development 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment 4. Develop and Implement Healthy School Action Plan
Person Responsible	Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

NA

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	**Areas of Focus: ELA**				**$700.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	6281 - Lake St. George Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$700.00
			Notes: This money will be spent on research based interventions for the lowest 25% of students along with professional development to support the teachers using the interventions.			
2	III.A	**Areas of Focus: Math**				**$700.00**

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	6281 - Lake St. George Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$700.00
			Notes: Budgeted money for math will include intervention materials used for the L25 and professional development necessary to support the teachers using the interventions.			
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science**				**$400.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	6281 - Lake St. George Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$400.00
			Notes: Money designated for science will support 5th grade teachers reviewing 3rd and 4th grade standards and holding a science camp.			
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap**				**$250.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	6281 - Lake St. George Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$250.00
			Notes: Money in this section will be used for schoolwide culturally responsive training.			
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning**				**$400.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	6281 - Lake St. George Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$400.00
			Notes: Money allocated in this area will be used for Restorative Practice, Equity and Responsive Learning.			
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$350.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	6281 - Lake St. George Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$350.00
			Notes: Budget will be used for front car circle signage and incentives to be in school.			
7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement**				**$350.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	6281 - Lake St. George Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$350.00

			Notes: Budgeted money here will help us buy supplies needed to have academics integrated with our family fun events.			
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools**				**$100.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	6281 - Lake St. George Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$100.00
			Notes: Budget used for incentaves to be healthy and recess equiptment.			
					Total:	**$3,250.00**