Prairie Lake Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Prairie Lake Elementary

8723 HACKNEY PRAIRIE RD, Orlando, FL 32818

https://prairielakees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Sean Downing

Start Date for this Principal: 11/1/2012

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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.

Table of Contents

Prairie Lake Elementary

8723 HACKNEY PRAIRIE RD, Orlando, FL 32818

https://prairielakees.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Strenth, Robert	Principal	• Hire and retain effective instructional and classified staff members. • Communicate with parents and community stakeholders. • Analyze data to monitor student and teacher performance • Create and monitor policies and procedures to ensure safe and effective school operations. • Oversee the instructional program for all students in all classes. • Monitor and provide feedback for instructional activities in all classes. • Monitor and analyze all student performance data by individual student, class, grade level, and school. • Supervise and evaluate all instructional and classified staff. • Purchase materials to support all students and staff. • Ensure accurate financial accountability of all school funds and purchases. • Ensure school compliance with all learning community, district, state, and federal rules and regulations. • Property custodian for all physical assets including the building and portables. • Coordinate programs and initiatives with PTO and SAC. • Attest to the accurate reporting of FTE program participation for all students. • Supervise and evaluate the leadership team. • Serve on the Positive Behavior Intervention Committee • Oversee and monitor school-wide implementation of explicit Social Emotional Learning (SEL) instruction.
Johnson, La Donna	Assistant Principal	● Supervise instructional programs for all grade levels with the principal. ● Formally assess and complete teacher evaluations with the principal. ● Oversee Intervention/Enrichment FBS Programs for all grade levels. ● Oversee the Academic MTSS process for all grade levels. ● Oversee all attendance-related issues with the Attendance Clerk, Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, and other parties. ● Attend weekly PLCs. ● Serve as Parent-Administrator Contact. ● Serve on the Positive Behavior Intervention Supports Committee. ● Oversee completion of the School Improvement Plan and corresponding updates. ● Oversee accurate reporting of state student data corrections. ● Coordinate all Minority Achievement Office Initiatives. ● Oversee student placement K-5. ● Assist Administrative Dean with discipline. ● Serve as Property Manager and oversee school fixed assets inventories. ● Supervise all ELL paraprofessionals. ● Supervise all custodians. ● Conduct monthly front office staff meetings ● Summer School Administrator. ● Serve as school principal in the absences of the principal. ● Other duties as assigned by the principal.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lowery, Christina	Staffing Specialist	● Oversee school-wide compliance with all ESE rules, requirements, and regulations. ● Conduct all IEP eligibility and annual review meetings. ● Determine eligibility of students be screened and/or placed in the EBD program. ● Oversee the gifted program. ● Consult with 504 Coordinator on all 504 Plans. ● Serve on the Positive Behavior Intervention Supports Committee. ● Coach instructional staff, including model teaching and professional development, on research-based academic accommodations and instructional strategies for ESE students. ● Oversee accurate reporting of ESE FTE. ● Assist Testing Coordinator with appropriate ESE accommodations. ● Serve as principal's ESE representative at meetings. ● Attend school functions. ● Other duties as assigned by principal.
Bishara, Erean	School Counselor	● Provide proactive social and behavioral support to students and parents. ● Provide coaching and professional development to staff on effectively working with students and parents in need of social and emotional support. ● Oversee and support the implementation of the district health curriculum. ● Schedule and chair Child Study team meetings related to attendance. ● Serve on the Positive Behavior Intervention Supports Committee. ● Schedule and chair monthly threat assessment meetings ● Serve as the school's Homeless Liaison. ● Oversee food, clothing, and supply pantry for students, parents, and community needs. ● Manage established partnerships and create new ones with faith-based and community service organizations to support school efforts. ● Assist grade level field trip representatives and school field trip coordinator to ensure equity of opportunity for all students to participate. ● Coordinate transition for 5th-grade students and receiving middle schools. ● Attend school functions. ● Other duties as assigned as principal.
Young, Melanie	Instructional Coach	● Provide coaching, professional development, model teaching, and other support for all teachers. ● Plan and oversee weekly PLCs with the principal, assistant principal, reading coach, and math/science coach. ● Conduct regularly scheduled data discussions with teachers. ● Oversee all common assessments. ● Monitor and disaggregate all student achievement data by district, school, grade level, class, and student. ● Assist with planning instructional responses to student performance data with reading and math/science coaches. ● Conduct non-evaluative observations and provide feedback. ● Oversee school-wide tutoring programs.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		● Serve on the Positive Behavior Intervention Supports Committee. ● Serve as backup testing coordinator. ● New Teacher Induction and Mentee Program Coordinator. ● College Volunteer Program Coordinator. ● Coordinate all school clubs. ● Coordinate family outreach activities. ● Attend school functions. ● Other duties as assigned by the principal.
Ferreras, Manuel	Dean	● Oversee school-wide compliance with the Orange County Code of Student Conduct. ● Oversee MTSS behavioral support. ● Coordinate MTSS Behavior Support with Assistant Principal. ● Oversee Tier II and Tier III behavior support including data collection and plan development. ● Coach instructional staff, including model teaching and professional development, on effective research-based Tier II and Tier III behavior interventions. ● Serve as principal's representative at disciplinary meetings. ● Serve on the Positive Behavior Intervention Supports Committee. ● Serve on the Social Emotional Learning Leadership Team. ● Oversee accurate completion and updates of the Safe School Plan. ● Serve as back-up to the ESOL Compliance Specialist ● Field trip coordinator. ● Schedule and conduct monthly safety drills. ● Schedule and oversee instructional and classified supervision duty locations, times, and responsibilities. ● Serve as the school administrator in the absence of the principal and assistant principals ● Attend school functions. ● Other duties as assigned by the principal.
Dietz, Joanna	Math Coach	● Provide coaching, professional development, model teaching, and other support regarding math and science instruction. ● Plan and oversee math and science PLCs with the principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach. ● Assist with planning instructional responses to student performance data regarding math and science data with an instructional coach. ● Serve as testing coordinator for content, district, and state assessments. ● Conduct non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback. ● Coordinate math and science family outreach activities. ● Attend school functions. ● Other duties as assigned by the principal.
Sotomayor Rodriguez, Paola	Reading Coach	● Provide coaching, professional development, model teaching, and other support regarding reading instruction. ● Plan and oversee reading PLCs with the principal, assistant principal, and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instructional coach. ● Assist with planning instructional responses to student performance data regarding reading data with an instructional coach. ● Oversee school-wide compliance with all ESOL rules, requirements, and regulations. ● Conduct all LEP eligibility and progress meetings. ● Coach instructional staff, including model teaching, on appropriate research-based accommodations and instructional strategies for LEP students. ● Collaborate with the principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach regarding instruction for LEP students ● Assist Testing Coordinators with ensuring appropriate LEP accommodations. ● Assist with Access testing. ● Chair Parent Leadership Council. ● Provide instructional assistance to LEP students in classrooms as directed. ● Attend school functions. ● Other duties as assigned by the principal.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 11/1/2012, Sean Downing

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Total number of students enrolled at the school
811

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	14	128	131	180	90	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	694
Attendance below 90 percent	2	39	30	49	20	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	3	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	19	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	5	40	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	6	30	48	26	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/5/2022

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	18	114	144	135	157	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	9	22	31	30	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	5	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	18	114	144	135	157	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	9	22	31	30	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	5	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	56%	56%				48%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						52%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						37%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	46%	50%				57%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						60%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						41%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	61%	59%				56%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	45%	55%	-10%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	54%	62%	-8%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	63%	-2%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	31	20	23	50	43	20				
ELL	30	50	38	32	68	73	33				
ASN	56	70		81	80						
BLK	41	60	50	41	63	57	49				
HSP	47	60	35	48	76	62	61				
MUL	69			81							
WHT	60	60		68	72		62				
FRL	41	57	48	42	64	63	49				

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15			21	17		8				
ELL	30	29		23	29		21				
ASN	71			59							
BLK	37	37	21	35	37	39	41				
HSP	50	53		40	35		67				
MUL	60			50							
WHT	63	55		61	67		67				
FRL	37	30	23	33	33	33	35				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	4	37	35	9	34	39	6				
ELL	29	36	42	45	60	36	45				
ASN	68	54		89	86						
BLK	42	51	35	51	57	33	46				
HSP	45	48	44	55	55	54	61				
WHT	62	54		70	65	45	78				
FRL	40	49	42	49	55	42	47				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
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	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
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	50
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	53
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	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	64
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends that emerged across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas were based on the Spring 2022 Reading and Mathematics iReady end-of-year assessments and the Florida State Assessment for ELA and math.
99% (914/917) of students participated in the Spring 2022 Reading and Math iReady assessment. 36% (329/914) of students achieved mid or above grade level in Reading based on overall placement scores. 31% (279/914) of students achieved mid or above grade level in math based on overall placement scores.

When stratifying individual grade level scores of second-grade through fifth-grade students, math proficiency was the subject area with the most significant potential for growth, with 19% (30/154) of second-grade students achieving mid or above grade level scores, 21% (32/153) of third-grade students achieving mid or above grade level scores, 23% (39/168) of fourth-grade students achieving mid or above grade level scores, and 27% (44/163) of fifth-grade students achieving mid or above grade level scores.

According to Performance Matters data, 47 students with disabilities were identified as the ESSA subgroup. Using the 2022 Florida State Assessments (FSA) Reading, 2022 FSA Math, 2022 Spring iReady Reading, and 2022 Spring iReady Math assessments. Of the 47 students, 20 participated in FSA testing, and all 47 participated in district Spring iReady testing. In Reading, students with disabilities scored 20% (4/20) proficiency on the ELA FSA and 17% (7/42) proficiency on iReady Reading. On the Math FSA, 35% (7/20) of students scored proficient, and 21% (9/42) achieved proficiency on iReady Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments demonstrated the greatest need for improvement are students with disabilities in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics. Forty-four students with disabilities participated in 2022 state assessments for ELA and Math. 16% (7/43) of third, fourth, and fifth grade students scored proficient or above on the ELA FSA. 20% (9/44) of students scored proficient or above on Math FSA. State proficiency scores have improved compared to 2019 state assessment scores of students with disabilities. In 2019, 4% of students with disabilities achieved proficiency in ELA, and 9% achieved proficiency in math. Proficiency scores for both ELA and math have improved, with an increase of 12-point proficiency in ELA and an 8-point increase in math. However, the improvements continue to be below ESSA expectations of achievement for students with disabilities.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors that attributed to this need for improvement included students' mastery of foundational skills in both reading and math. Also, students' truancy during foundational skills instructional block and core subject instruction was a factor due to students not being at school for reading and math instruction. The new actions that will be taken to address the factors of foundation skills acquisition include master schedule explicitly ensures that foundational skills blocks are at different times throughout the day so that exceptional student education (ESE) teachers and interventionists may pull students for foundation skills instruction throughout the day. Two interventionist were hired to help pull small groups of students during the FBS blocks for reading and math. The reading interventionist is reading endorsed and will push into classrooms during ELA instructional block. Students with truancy issues will be closely monitored during child study team meetings and tracked for attendance issues with the school registrar, counselor, and social worker. Parent meetings will be held to discuss truancy trends and student academic progress. Students' minutes with ESE teachers will be adjusted based on students' academic needs in reading and math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement were the Science progress monitoring assessments from Fall 2021, Winter 2021, and Spring 2022. Scores were as follows: Fall (Proficiency: Overall: 59% (86/146); Students with Disabilities: 23% (5/22); English Language Learners: 33% (4/12); and Economically Disadvantaged: 49% (41/83)), Winter (Proficiency: Overall: 56% (82/146); Students with Disabilities: 22% (5/23); English Language Learners: 20% (3/15); and Economically Disadvantaged: 44% (35/80)), and Winter (Proficiency: Overall: 55% (85/155); Students with Disabilities: 17% (45/24); English Language Learners 19% (3/16); and Economically Disadvantaged: 44% (38/86)).

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to this improvement were due to five focused instructional strategies. The first instructional strategies included targeted reteach opportunities on Wednesday for students who read on grade level but achieved below grade level expectations on science common assessments. The second strategy incorporated instructional staff restructured the pacing of science big ideas for content utilization content and reteach days on science concepts that required more instructional time for student attainment of content. The third strategy involved reteaching opportunities for the lowest achieved standards during class centers. The fourth strategy was a four-week Super Science Saturday enrichment camp that covered standards that most students had not mastered. The activities included interactive science activities and experiments. The fifth instructional focus was on explicit science vocabulary instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The strategies that will continue to be implemented to accelerate learning will be the use of pre-assessments before standards are introduced to help facilitate the whole class and individual student's instructional needs. Teachers will use the CRA (concrete, representation, and abstract) modeling during instruction during math and science. In addition, instructional staff will continue to teach academics explicitly and subject area vocabulary (all subject areas), use small group instruction and data to track student instructional needs after common assessments to reorganize instructional teacher-led small groupings.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities will focus on small group and center activities and instruction. Teachers will receive explicit instruction that covers the modeling of the use of CRA (concrete, representation, and abstract) in math and science. The administration will adapt the professional development plan based on teacher input, school-wide walk-through trends, and common assessments and progress monitoring data trends throughout the year.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement in the next year will include one-on-one coaching based on tier support for teachers and monthly data chats to include all stakeholders to maximize student success through needed interventions. The following positions have been added to aid in the implementation of school improvement in the areas of reading, math, and students performing at the lowest percentile: a reading coach, math/science coach, instructional coach, reading interventionist, and math interventionist.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	According to the 2022 ELA Florida Assessment Test (FSA), 48% of third- fifth-grade students scored proficiency in reading. Spring iReady ELA assessment indicates that 28% of students were proficient in kindergarten - fifth grades. The 2022 score of 48% meeting proficiency in ELA means that Prairie Lake Elementary school met its school improvement goal for the 2021-2022 school year; however, when compared to math proficiency and science proficiency, ELA scores continue to trend the lowest in proficiency across ELA, math, and science content. 52% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA Spring 2022 iReady diagnostic data indicated that 28% of students in grades kindergarten - fifth grades reached mid-grade level or higher proficiency. By Spring 2023, 50% of students grades kindergarten - fifth grades will score mid-grade level or higher on the iReady ELA Spring diagnostic assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The ELA instructional practice will be monitored for the desired outcome by weekly analysis of classroom walkthrough data by the principal with the leadership team, i-Ready growth and (beginning, middle, and end of year) diagnostics, monthly data chats with stakeholders, progress monitoring activities for SIPPS (mastery assessments), monthly meetings on Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports, use of district standards-based unit assessments (for ELA), and CORE phonics survey (beginning, middle, and end of year) for grades kindergarten through second.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Strenth (robert.strenth@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	The rationale for selecting to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and give opportunities for students to read connected text daily to support reading rates, accuracy, and expression from analyzing Spring 2022 iReady data and teacher end-of-year data chats. The data indicated a need for phonics instruction school-wide. Based on this data, the core instruction has been modified to include intense phonics instruction in first through third grades. The SIPPS program was implemented during the foundation of the basic skills block for grades one through five based on individual student data. Once students have developed adequate fluency skills to read, comprehension practices in

implemented for this Area of Focus.	grades third through fifth will introduce that include teacher modeling of fluency and expression, think-aloud, and explicitly taught comprehension skills such as context clues, vocabulary, thinking maps, and making predictions or inferences about the text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The rationale for selecting to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and give opportunities for students to read connected text daily to support reading rates, accuracy, and expression from analyzing Spring 2022 iReady data and teacher end-of-year data chats. The data indicated a need for phonics instruction school-wide. Based on this data, the core instruction has been modified to include intense phonics instruction in first through third grades. The SIPPS program was implemented during the foundation of the basic skills block for grades one through five based on individual student data.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Strengthen the common planning process.
- Use the district-created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions
- Include foundational planning in K-2
Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.
Ensure the 90-minute reading block contains statutory requirements.
- 6 components of reading (as noted in Florida's Formula for success)
- Daily inclusion of on-level whole group instruction and differentiated small group instruction
Standards-Based Unit Assessment (SBUA) Data and Foundational Assessment Data is used to plan small group instruction and differentiation opportunities.
Provide targeted ELA PD based on teacher needs (consider B.E.S.T. ELA Canvas course, recorded sessions from the Early Literacy Summer Institute, and when applicable, ELA IMPACT).
MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure:
- Students are appropriately identified.
- Reading interventionist meet with students on a consistent basis to provide additional support

Person Responsible	Robert Strenth (robert.strenth@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	According to 2022 FSA ELA data students with disabilities subgroup was 10% proficient. The ELA proficiency score result is 31% points below the minimum 41% federal index. This will be the third consecutive year students with disabilities have not met the federal index.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By Spring 2022, overall ELA proficiency scores for students with disabilities on the iReady diagnostic will increase from 28% of overall proficiency for students with disabilities to 41%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The staffing specialist met with individual teachers on August 04, 2022, to review Individualized educational plans and accommodations to plan standard-based lessons intentionally. School stakeholders' meetings will commence every four weeks to analyze current data, including common assessments, benchmarks, progress monitoring, attendance, discipline, ELL, SEL initiatives, and teacher observations. ESE teachers will be included in the meetings to adjust strategies and minutes and/or give feedback on students with disabilities. Administration, Reading coach, and instructional coach will analyze teacher small groups' effectiveness by comparing pre-post tests as well as re-assessments through teacher data tracking logs. Classroom walk-throughs will be conducted for effective instructional strategy implementation, and student assessment data will be monitored for student progress and instructional decisions/adjustments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Strenth (robert.strenth@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy	The following are evidence-based strategies that will be implemented to increase the students with disabilities' proficiency in reading. • Promoting collaborative problem solving and open communication among stakeholders • Collecting, analyzing, and using data to identify student and teacher needs • Using data to identify and plan for needed changes in the instructional program • Implementing and monitoring the individualized education plan for students with disabilities

being implemented for this Area of Focus.	• Using systems thinking to establish a clear focus on attaining student achievement goals • Engages staff and other stakeholders in a collaborative process to clarify the problem(s) • Identifies discrepancies between current and desired outcomes
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The specific strategy that has been selected is the five steps for structuring data-informed conversations and action by the Institute for Education Science. The rationale in which this strategy provides a framework needed to support data-informed conversations and action by individual stakeholders that are being held accountable for each student. The framework has five key steps in using data for decision-making and strategic action: setting the stage, examining the data, understanding the findings, developing an action plan, monitoring progress, and measuring success. This strategy will make the process easier for teachers and stakeholders to understand the student's present level of performance, where the student needs to be, and what each stakeholder needs to do to ensure student success.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide professional development overview training for teachers to understand students' IEPs and accommodations.

Person Responsible	Christina Lowery (christina.lowery@ocps.net)

Conduct biweekly ESE meetings to review academic data for ELA and math to make instructional decisions with general education and ESE teachers. Teachers will conduct/document data chats with students after each iReady Diagnostic Assessment. Students will track their iReady lessons, and the teacher will review iReady data with students about their weekly iReady usage (minutes, accuracy expectancy (70% or higher), and assignments completed). Evaluate the alignment of ESE support models, accommodations, and student needs. Analyze student data and IEP goals for ELA and math. Shift ESE focus to foundational gaps when gaps are observed through data analysis of Fall assessment data. Strategically schedule ELA and math basic skills disjointed intervention blocks, which will allow ESE teachers and intervention teachers to pull students from all grade levels for math and ELA intervention.

Person Responsible	La Donna Johnson (ladonna.johnson@ocps.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the 2022 ELA Florida Assessment Test (FSA), 52% of third- fifth-grade students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts. The Spring iReady ELA assessment data indicates that 72% of students in grades kindergarten - fifth scored below proficiency. School-wide instructional practices include: Teachers will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to strengthen pedagogy related to content instruction; teacher and reading coach monitoring weekly student iReady assignments; administrative weekly monitoring of iReady weekly minutes and mastery of assignments completed; teacher pre-post test data reviews and adjusted reteach scheduling based on data outcomes; teacher/ parent conferences and MTSS parent/ coach meetings when needed to discuss reading expectations and school/home supports for reading practice; teacher implemented small group instruction and use of instructional resources for students with foundation reading skills deficits with fidelity. Below is a breakdown of 2022 end-of-year iReady assessment scores.

Kindergarten - 35% (47/133) of students did not meet proficiency. Kindergarten grade level met RAISE proficiency requirements of 50% or more students meeting grade level proficiency in ELA..

First-Grade - 54% (74/136) of students did not meet proficiency. This data point meets expectations for RAISE as 46% of students met proficiency standards.

Second-Grade - 59% (91/153) of students did not meet proficiency. This data point meets expectations for RAISE as 41% of students met proficiency standards.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the 2022 ELA Florida Assessment Test (FSA), 52% of third- fifth-grade students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts. The Spring iReady ELA assessment data indicates that 72% of students in grades kindergarten - fifth scored below proficiency. School-wide instructional practice includes: Teachers will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to strengthen pedagogy related to reading instruction; teacher and reading coach monitoring weekly student iReady assignments; administrative weekly monitoring of iReady weekly minutes and mastery of assignments completed; teacher pre-post test data reviews and adjusted reteach scheduling based on data outcomes; teacher/parent conferences and MTSS parent/ coach meetings when needed to discuss reading expectations and school/home supports for reading practice; teacher implemented small group instruction and use of instructional resources for students with foundation reading skills deficits with fidelity. Below is a breakdown of 2022 end-of-year iReady assessment scores.

Third-Grade - According to Spring FSA ELA data, 58% of students did not meet ELA proficiency standards. This data point meets expectations for RAISE, as 42% of third-grade students achieved a level 3 or higher on the state assessment.

Fourth-Grade - According to Spring FSA ELA data, 51% of students did not meet ELA proficiency standards. This data point meets expectations for RAISE, as 49% of fourth-grade students achieved a level 3 or higher on the state assessment.

Fifth-Grade - According to Spring FSA ELA data, 48% of students did not meet ELA proficiency standards. This data point does not meet the expectations for Raise as 52% of fifth-grade students achieved a level 3 or higher on the state assessment.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By Spring 2023, 50% or higher of students grades kindergarten - fifth grades will score mid-grade level or higher on the iReady ELA Spring diagnostic assessment. ELA Spring 2022 iReady diagnostic data indicated that 28% of students in grades kindergarten - fifth grades reached mid-grade level or higher proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By Spring 2023, 50% or higher of students grades kindergarten - fifth grades will score mid-grade level or higher on the iReady ELA Spring diagnostic assessment. ELA Spring 2022 iReady diagnostic data indicated that 28% of students in grades kindergarten - fifth grades reached mid-grade level or higher proficiency.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The ELA instructional practice will be monitored for the desired outcome by weekly analysis of classroom walkthrough data by the principal with the leadership team, i-Ready growth and (beginning, middle, and end of year) diagnostics monthly data chats with stakeholders, progress monitoring activities for SIPPS (mastery assessments), monthly meetings on Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports, use of district standards-based unit assessments (for ELA), and CORE phonics survey (beginning, middle, and end of year).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Strenth, Robert, robert.strenth@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

   ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

   ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

   ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and have opportunities to read connected text daily to support reading rate, accuracy, and expression. Teachers will also model reading fluency and think-aloud and explicitly teach comprehension skills to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

   ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

   ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The rationale for selecting to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and give opportunities for students to read connected text daily to support reading rates, accuracy, and expression from analyzing Spring 2022 iReady data and teacher end-of-year data chats. The data indicated a need for phonics instruction school-wide. Based on this data, the core instruction has been modified to include intense phonics instruction in first through third grades. The SIPPS program was implemented during the foundation of the basic skills block for grades one through five based on individual student data. Once students have developed adequate fluency skills to read, comprehension practices in grades third through fifth will introduce that include teacher modeling of fluency and expression, think-aloud, and explicitly taught comprehension skills such as context clues, vocabulary, thinking maps, and making predictions or inferences about the text.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership • Establish two-45-minute uninterrupted planning periods for instructional staff daily • Schedule weekly PLC meeting times with a reading coach • Establishes ELA coaching cycles to include reading and instructional coach for teacher support • Utilize class walkthrough tool and schedule with coaching staff and administration • Weekly leadership meeting data chats on walkthrough trends • Update professional development calendar based on walkthrough and data trends, and instructional suggestions • Provide coverage when possible for district opportunities for ELA professional development (i.e., strategies, materials, and instructional practices)	Strenth, Robert, robert.strenth@ocps.net
Professional Learning -Dedicating two Wednesdays a month to professional development related to literacy -Targeted classroom observations and walkthroughs to progress monitor implementation of strategies and activities (Engagement, monitoring, and pacing of instruction) -Send teachers to monthly ELA district training and utilize train the teacher model for school wide implementation	Strenth, Robert, robert.strenth@ocps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Prairie Lake Elementary has built into its master schedule time at the beginning of each school day for teachers to facilitate class meetings for students to discuss concerns and ideas and to debrief about what is happening in their lives. Social and emotional learning lessons are also taught during this time. Students are celebrated in monthly events for achieving academic successes and for demonstrating positive

character traits. Staff members attend monthly fellowship activities where they are paired with a variety of peers for bonding and team-building activities. The principal hosts monthly events where parents and staff can share concerns and ideas, and the principal provides written follow-ups.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Robert Strenth, Principal
-Engages all stakeholders for input on school needs, develops school-wide supports and programs to promote a positive culture and environment, and monitors and adjusts based on data and input.

La Donna Johnson-Assistant Principal
-Assists principal with engaging all stakeholders for input on school needs, develops school-wide supports and programs to promote a positive culture and environment, and monitors and adjusts based on data and input.

Manuel Ferreras-Dean
-Monitors and provides behavior support to teachers and students and develops individualized behavior plans with measurable goals for identified students.

Erean Bishara-Guidance Counselor
-Provide group and individual counseling to students, promote school-wide initiatives focused on positive behaviors, emotional health, and good character traits, and assist teachers and parents by providing resources, strategies, and classroom and home supports.

Melanie Young -Instructional Coach
-Provide Professional Development, Individual Coaching, and Model Teaching to assist teachers with developing lessons that promote engagement, cultural relevancy, and belonging among students.

Michelle Ishmail-Media Specialist
-Provides a diverse selection of reading materials that reflect the student population, hosts student celebrations for academic achievements, and assists with planning high-engagement student-parent events.