

Duval County Public Schools

Lake Lucina Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Lake Lucina Elementary School

6527 MERRILL RD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

<http://www.duvalschools.org/lle>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Walsh

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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 Duval 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

OUR MISSION: Lake Lucina is committed to differentiating instruction to inspire our diverse population to reach their highest potential in our ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement

OUR VISION: The Lake Lucina community will provide each student with solid academic and social skills to be successful in secondary education.

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
Walsh, Michelle	Principal	Michelle Walsh (Principal) provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Core and Rtl, conducts assessment of Core and Rtl of school staff, ensures implementation of Core and intervention support and documentation, ensures appropriate and effective professional development to support the Core and Rtl implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based Core and Rtl plans and activities.
Brown, Latrece	Assistant Principal	Latrece Sudduth (Assistant Principal) collaborates with Principal to support a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making. Assists to ensure that the school-based team is implementing Core and Rtl, conducts assessment of Core and Rtl of school staff, and assists to ensure implementation of Core and intervention support and documentation. Assists to ensure appropriate and effective professional development to support the Core and Rtl implementation and assists with the communicating with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities.
Bailey, Kelli	Instructional Coach	Kelli Bailey (Reading Coach) develops, leads, and evaluates the school core content standards/ program; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches, identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Warren, Amy	Guidance Counselor	Amy Warren (School Counselor) designs programs that address academic, career, and personal/social development of every student that includes identification of students who are at-risk for not meeting academic and/or behavioral expectations. Assists classroom teacher in development and documentation of academic and/or behavior interventions. Provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; provides group and individual student interventions; and conducts direct observation of student behavior. Contacts the behavior interventionist, as needed, for additional support and plan development.
Thompson, Donna	Teacher, ESE	Donna Thompson (ESE Teacher) Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnston, Lara	Teacher, ESE	Tier 2/3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. Lara Johnston (ESE Teacher) Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2/3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/8/2020, Michelle Walsh

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.*

1

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Students With Disabilities White Students

School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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	55	40	40	53	49	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	285
Attendance below 90 percent	4	13	12	13	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	1	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	2	4	7	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

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	56	41	43	61	49	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	304
Attendance below 90 percent	4	14	14	15	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	56	41	43	61	49	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	304
Attendance below 90 percent	4	14	14	15	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	43%	50%	57%	44%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	58%	51%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	53%	55%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	53%	62%	63%	62%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	51%	63%	62%	69%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	51%	70%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	42%	48%	53%	58%	55%	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	42%	51%	-9%	58%	-16%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	52%	-5%	58%	-11%
	2018	41%	49%	-8%	56%	-15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	43%	50%	-7%	56%	-13%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	64%	1%	64%	1%
	2018	61%	60%	1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	49%	-9%	53%	-13%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	18	46		26	46	47	8				
ELL	18	33		27	64						
BLK	43	55	29	52	46	35	38				
HSP	38	55		46	55						
WHT	36	60		53	52		64				
FRL	40	55	48	50	46	45	36				

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	17	44		33	36						
ELL	62	60		46	90						
BLK	34	43	50	60	67	67	40				
HSP	56	59		64	82						
MUL	64	60		57	70						
WHT	50	59		65	65		62				
FRL	41	49	48	61	70	68	56				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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	49
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	53
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	46
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

2019 Spring ELA Achievement showed the lowest performance with 43% of all 3-5 students scoring at or above a Level 3 and 43% of the lowest performing quartile making a learning gain. For the past 5 years, Lake Lucina reading proficiency data has not exceeded 44% and lowest performing and overall learning gains have not exceeded 55%. This can be contributed to the lack of explicit direct instruction for reading in the primary grades that has resulted in low performance in the FSA accountability grades.

The high mobility rate in the Arlington area is also a contributing factor in continued low overall Reading Proficiency. Only 13 out of the 49 students in the 5th Grade 2020 graduating class had attended Lake Lucina since Kindergarten.

2020 ELA PMA 2 Data indicated that 3rd through 5th grade students all struggled with RI.1.2 (Determine the Main Idea) and RL.1.2 (Determining Theme) with all three grade levels scoring in the bottom quartile on these standards.

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

2019 Spring Math Achievement and learning gains showed the greatest decline from 2018 Spring FSA Data dropping from 62 % to 53% proficient, from 69% to 51% in learning gains, and from 70% to 50% in lowest performing quartile. 2017-2018 were the highest scores in math the school had earned on FSA. The decline can be contributed to the lack of a math coach. The school added a math coach the one year it earned an B rating. This was the only year the school had direct math support outside of administration. Prior in the 2016 school year, math was ranked in the 22nd percentile in comparison to all other Florida elementary schools.

2018-2019 followed Eurika Math modules outlined in the district Curriculum Guide which is not strongly aligned to FSA item specifications and MAFS.

2019-2020 School Year focused on common planning that had a clear structure, focus, purpose, and expected outcome under the supervision of the Assistant Principal. Math Units of Study were rearranged, portions replaced, and additional remediation cycles implemented. Data was consistently trending above the district average with the emphasis on Standards Driven Planning & Instruction.

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

2019 Spring ELA Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with a 14% difference from 43% to 57%. For the 118 students with previous FSA scores last school year, only 38% started the year with a proficient score of Level 3 and above. 31% were Level 1 and 30% were a Level 2. i-Ready Diagnostic Data indicated students were missing K-2 foundational skills such as phonics.

2019-2020 School year introduced a new Direct Reading Instruction program that was not in place in year past. For the first time, there was district initiative K-5 at select Title

1 school that explicitly taught students to reading in K-1 and systematically remediated in 2 - 5. Because there was not a researched based reading program in place, this resulted in lower ELA proficiency school wide.

2020 Spring Direct Instruction Data shows a continued large percentage of students below grade level in reading.

2020-2021 3rd Graders: 10 placing in RMSE KG and 30 placing in RMSE 1st

2020-2021 4th Graders: 3 placing in RMSE KG, 20 placing in Corrective Reading B1, 8 placing in Corrective Reading B2, and 18 placing out of Corrective Reading on Grade Level

2020-2021 5th Graders: 38 placing in Corrective Reading B1 and 11 placing out of Corrective Reading On Grade Level

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

2019 Spring ELA Learning Gains showed the most improvement with a 6% gain going from 51% to 57%. The school focused on FSA writing instruction to impact overall ELA performance. 5th grade students went from 48% earning at least a 6 out of 10 to 67%. This is an increase of 19%. Comparing 4th grade from Spring 2017 to Spring 2018, there was a 3% increase in students scoring at or above a 6 on FSA Writing. In addition, Phonics for Reading and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) were both used as researched based small group intervention programs. A reading interventionist was added in October by the district and was used to co-teach with the 4th grade teacher which allowed for additional small group support

2019-2020 School year again focused on Writing in 4th and 5th Grade ELA to impact overall proficiency scores. Top Score Writing program was introduced and structured strategies were used to explicitly teach the element of Opinion and Informative Writing. Direct Instruction was also introduced during the ELA block K-5 systematically teaching how to read through decoding and other foundational skills using Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading programs from SRA. In 3rd grade, there were 7 students who placed in Reading Mastery Kindergarten Level and by March, all 7 were on BI Lesson 45 which is 2nd grade level.

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

2017-2018 Attendance Rate was a concern with 61 students missing 15 or more days in the school year. This is 19% of the school's population. 29 of the students were in grades 3-5. 5 of the students were in the LPQ for ELA and 4 out of the 5 are both LPQ for ELA and Math.

2018-2019 Attendance Rate continued to be a concern with 53 students missing 15 or more days in the school year. This is 17% of the school's population. 24 were in grades 3-5. 4 of the students were in the LPQ for ELA and 3 out of the 4 are both LPQ for ELA and Math.

2019-2020 will rollover on July 1, 2020.

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

1. Aligned standards instruction
2. Culture & Climate
3. Informed Assessments (Formative and Summative)
3. Differentiated Professional Development

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The priority area of focus is on Instructional Practices around standards-aligned instruction. By focusing on the standard (the depth, item specifications, ADLs, pre-conceptions/misconceptions, and vertical alignment), it will develop a better conceptual understanding for the teacher and result in more aligned lesson planning. This will impact students learning and engagement in the classroom resulting in increased achievement levels in all content areas.

Measurable outcomes will include, but are not limited, to the following:

Measureable Outcome:

- Baseline to Spring Direct Instruction student placement (Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading Grade & Lesson
- Fall to Spring iReady Diagnostics for Math and Reading
- Fall to Spring Achievement Lexile monthly adjustments and Level Sets
- Baseline to PMA District Assessment Results
- Text Dependent Writing Cycles with Aligned FSA Rubric Progress Checks
- Module / Unit Assessment Data
- Remediation Cycle Data Number along with Mastery Test Data)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Walsh (walshm@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Administration will be used to design, monitor and assess ELA & Math achievement progress; provide professional development through common planning/early dismissals and coaching for teachers to ensure strong alignment to the standards. A reading coach position will assist with these tasks.
- A Math Interventionist position will be used to provide immediate, systematic, standards remediation.
- Part-time teaching positions will be used to implement researched based programs with fidelity before, during, or after school.
- Top Score program will be used to provide aligned FSA Text based Writing experiences.
- J & J Bootcamp Science materials will be utilized to provide students daily aligned practice on annually assessment benchmarks.
- A 30 minute remediation block will be built into the master schedule to provide continuous exposure to FSA like math problems using IXL and other aligned resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- A portion of the ELA block will be utilized for Reading Direct Instruction.
- Math & ELA support is needed to assist new and veteran teachers in implementing aligned formative and diagnostic assessments in an ongoing cycle of continuous Improvement.
- Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading are direct instruction programs

specifically designed to accelerate students' reading abilities who are significantly behind grade level.

-Standards based remediation cycles increase student understanding of FSA like math problems and ELA Texts and Questioning.

-Students scoring Level 1 and 2 consistently score the lowest in Numbers and Operations and IXL will provide weekly fluency practice.

-TOP Score curriculum has been designed, developed, and researched in Florida schools and has a proven track record of increasing student textbased writing scores that impact their overall ELA Proficiency.

-J & J Bootcamp is aligned FCAT 2.0 Science materials that will expose students to daily practice on the annually assessed benchmarks.

Action Steps to Implement

- Use Standards, Item Specification, ADLs, CPALMS and other resources to fully unpack standards prior to planning, teaching, and learning.

-Use District aligned Standards Walkthrough Tool to monitor instructional delivery of standards

-Implement a system for student assessment of learning that creates multiple assessment opportunities and expects all student to demonstrate learning.

- Content area teachers will meet for common planning weekly with the Administration. The focus of common planning will be to determine and plan for which resources are most aligned to the standards to use for Core instruction, what assessments will be used to measure student learning, and to identify the students who need extra instructional help and what resources in small group will be most beneficial to support the struggling learners.

-All teachers will be supported through coaching cycles that will focus on one area of growth in order to build capacity within the building.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Schools with strong supportive environments lead to academic achievement. Based on the UChicago Impact students survey results from 4th and 5th grade students, Lake Lucina scored overall in the Orange Range (20-40%) for Supportive Environment.</p> <p>Measurable outcomes will include, but are not limited, to the following: Peer Support for Academic Work: 39 Weak Student-Teacher Trust: 23 Weak Academic Personalism: 20 Weak Safety: 12 Very Weak</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Measurable outcomes will include, but are not limited, to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School Created Microsoft Forms Survey with UChicago Questions - Common Planning Agendas, Notes, and Lesson Plans - Character Trait Book of the Month Responses - Wellness Wednesday Participation and Personal Journal Entries - Module and Unit Assessment Data - Remediation Cycles -DOJO Points
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Michelle Walsh (walshm@duvalschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use Microsoft Forms to create a survey with the same questions as the UChicago Impact survey to use the results in creating morning meeting agenda topics / Wellness Wednesday lessons. - Use Common Planning to embed collaborative strategies, ensure academic press, provide for differentiation, progress monitoring, and student support opportunities. - Initiate a Character Trait Book of the Month to address sensitive topics related to social and emotional needs. -Create "Personal Journals" to allow for student reflection on Social and Emotional lessons / morning reflection questions. - Create student tracking sheets to allow for self-lead academic progress monitoring. - Use remediation cycles to increase academic personalism where students feel they are being helped to catch up, can recognize the teacher noticed they were struggling, and were provided the opportunity to learn in a different way. - Use Positive Paws to reinforce peer support during academic work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>For the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school year, student survey data has shown that Lake Lucina is overall partially organized in the area of Supportive Environment. Academic Personalism had the largest decline from 78 to 20 showing a great need to address lesson planning that incorporates collaboration, differentiation, opportunities to learn in a variety of ways along with consistent feedback from the teacher. Using a baseline survey will allow staff to collect current responses from the 2020-2021 set of 4th and 5th grade students to ensure the school is focusing on the right strategies and support. Adding personal journals to morning work and Wellness Wednesday</p>

allows for self-reflection and sharing to build a trusting social and emotional environment. Adding universal tracking sheets will provide consistency on expectations for students to be self-assessing and monitoring the English and math instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

The school-wide PBIS / MTSS teams will meet monthly to review progress toward goals.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Through the evaluation of Teacher Schedules, Common Planning Schedules and Agendas, Classroom observations and Student Work Analysis, the School Improvement goals will be monitored and adjusted to target addition school wide improvement priorities.

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.

Mission Statement: Lake Lucina is committed to differentiating instruction to inspire our diverse population to reach their highest potential in our ever-changing world.

The school engages parents during the annual Meet & Greet in August and Open House in September to gain input on the PFEP and Parent Compact. Each year, stakeholders are invited and encourage to join SAC to provide monthly on-going feedback on the school's progress toward its SIP goals and PFEP events. The school continues to engage with the faith based community to build awareness of Lake Lucina initiatives and build partnerships where the faith based community works within the school. Monthly parent events are planned to engage parents and provide them with opportunities to learn content and strategies they can use at home with their children.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$144,207.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0851 - Lake Lucina Elementary School	Title, I Part A	306.0	\$144,207.00
			<i>Notes: School-based reading coach School-based math interventionist Part-Time Tutor III</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				\$0.00
					Total:	\$144,207.00