Lakeview Fundamental Elementary

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lakeview Fundamental Elementary

2229 25TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

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

Demographics

Principal: Susan Garcia Nikolova J   Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2019

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)	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 Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: B
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * 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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Baker, Tijuana	Principal
Principal	
Joyce, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Altman-Wood, Kari	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Lindsey, Laura	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Griffin, Beth	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Panico, Debra	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Matthews, Clarissa	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	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
	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	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	

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

18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/14/2019

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

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	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							

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	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

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
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

*Check district data for science and see how we compare
New actions?
Science lab added to school
Worked through scheduling of science lab for "science day"
Increased awareness of pacing, use of science journals with fidelity
(table from http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/k-12-student-assessment/results/2019.stml)

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

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. 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	
Title	L25 ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 32%, as evidenced in FSA L25 Learning Gains, which is below both the state and district performance.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Prioritize engaging students in authentic prolonged reading tasks, discussion and writing with feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	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%

Action Step	
Description	1. Increase the effectiveness of core instruction which will allow Teachers to effectively move students to mastery with appropriately targeted differentiated instructional supports. 2. Ensuring that ample and additional time is given to read and write appropriate grade level text and apply foundational skills, with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. 2. PLC's will be held consistently and focus on learning outcomes, indicators of success and best practices. 3. Ensure that Jan Richardson is being implemented as designed within the classroom setting by providing embedded professional development and monitoring with feedback from administration. A variety of small group research based strategies will be used during core instructional and intervention time to allow students the opportunity to access and engage with grade level texts. 4. PLC and SBLT Team Self Assessment data will be used to support this area of focus 5. Maximize gifted days to allow for additional opportunities to meet the differentiated needs of all learners.
Person Responsible	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	ESSA Students with Disabilities Proficiency
Rationale	Our ESSA ESE current status is 32%
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our ESSA goal for the 2019/20 school year will increase to 51%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Common Planning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The downward trend of ESE students making learning gains requires intense modifications of strategies and professional development opportunities at our school.

Action Step	
Description	1. Common 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, Linda M. Bell, JR, IRLA or Spire)
Person Responsible	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	1. 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

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of third grade students identified as 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 Step	
Description	1. Implement Ready Math core instruction which will allow teachers to effectively move students to mastery with appropriately targeted differentiated instructional supports. 2. PLC's, Curriculum Meetings, and Feedback will be used to support effective planning and implementation of the core curriculum. 3. PLC and SBLT Team Self Assessments data will be used to support this area of focus. 4. Selection of challenging tasks for gifted students using ready math differentiation resources 5. Planning for high level questions to challenge gifted students.
Person Responsible	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Science
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 72% proficient, as evidenced in 2018-2019 Science Assessment.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of 5th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 72% to 82%, as measured by 2019-2020 Science Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered with rigor for all science labs and core instruction in grades 1-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1.Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment of the 1-5 grade standards. 2.Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th Grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment.

Action Step	
Description	1. 4th and 5th Grade students will be given science unit assessments 2. Teachers will use the data from unit and cycle assessments to support the review plan. 3. Monitor science labs for fidelity using the pre and post tests in grades 1-5.
Person Responsible	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Bridging the Gap
Rationale	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.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of black students scoring level 3 and above on the 2019-20 FSA ELA will increase from 45.4% to 60%, as measured by 2019-20 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 Step

Description	1. Ensure that at least 25% of teachers are trained by May 2020 (4 teachers should already be trained during 2018-19) in AVID CRT. 2. Monitor Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies through formal and informal observations. 3. Equity based PLC/ SBLT 3. Equity embedded PD
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#6	
Title	Conditions for Learning
Rationale	Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 7 referrals for the year. We expect our performance level to be 2 referrals by May 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students receiving a referral will decrease from 7 to 2, as measured by the number of referrals written.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students by creating an environment where students feel they belong and are welcomed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Every teacher and school based staff must engage in strategies and supports that the academic , social-emotional and behavioral needs of each and every student are known and met as part of PCS Equity and Excellence for ALL Plan.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will actively display, teach/reteach and implement school wide Tier 1 Practices and strategies 2. Conduct and continuously improve on RP circles on a daily basis
Person Responsible	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our current attendance rate is 95.8%. We expect our performance level to be 98.5% by May 2020.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 4% to 1%, 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 Step

Description	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	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Family and Community Engagegment
Rationale	Partnerships with families and the community are an integral part of creating a positive school climate and assuring high academic achievement for students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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 Step	
Description	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 breakfast/orientation at the beginning of the school year 4. Set up a pick up point for volunteer activities 5. Curriculum nights (Literacy, Science etc) are incorporated into our monthly PTA Meetings.
Person Responsible	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Increase healthy habits of all students. Go back to include status

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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 Step	
Description	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. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

#10	
Title	Gifted
Rationale	Our goal is to have 75% of our gifted students score a level 4 or 5 on state assessments

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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 Step	
Description	1. Use of ELA module extension for above grade level learners 2. Teachers intentionally plan for differentiation using MAP and FSA data (ELA and Math) 3. Administrators monitor and provide feedback after each assessment cycle (use MAP quadrant chart for feedback)
Person Responsible	Tijuana Baker (bakerti@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)

n/a

		Part V: Budget				
1	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: L25 ELA Learning Gains**				**$1,750.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		140-Substitute Teachers	1961 - Lakeview Fundamental Elem.	School Improvement Funds		$1,750.00
			Notes: Provide TDE's for all instructional staff to allow time for collaboration, observation			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Students with Disabilities Proficiency**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap**				**$0.00**
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagegment**				**$0.00**
9	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**
10	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Gifted**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$1,750.00**