

Orange County Public Schools

Prairie Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Prairie Lake Elementary

8723 HACKNEY PRAIRIE RD, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://prairielakees.ocps.net/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, La Donna	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal assists the Principal with the overall management of the school's operational and educational programs. The Assistant Principal serves on the school's Leadership Team, assisting with instructional leadership and providing oversight and management supporting the fidelity of the school's MTSS program. In addition, the Assistant Principal partners with the Principal to supervise and evaluate teachers and provides resources and support to instructional staff in terms of supplies/equipment, time, opportunity, and structure for collaborative planning and evaluation of the instructional program. The Assistant Principal also oversees the school's Safety/Emergency Response Program and serves as the school's Title IX officer. Last, the Assistant Principal maintains inventories and ensures the smooth operation and maintenance of school facilities to support the school's mission and vision.</p>
Bishara, Erean	School Counselor	<p>The Guidance Counselor provides direct assistance and intervention services to students in need. The counselor conducts threat assessments, works with families and district support staff to create and manage safety plans, mentors and counsels individual students, and works with the Assistant Principal and teachers to conduct Universal Mental Health screenings. The counselor also serves on the MTSS Leadership and Problem Solving Teams to assist with a variety of RTI initiatives in support of PLE's students.</p>
Young, Melanie	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach provides mentoring and coaching support to the instructional staff, as needed. More intensive support is provided to new staff. This coach serves the ELA Program primarily; however, also assists with any member of the instructional staff in need of support. The coach maintains data, coordinates common and diagnostic assessments, participates in collaborative planning with grade-level content teams, and provides resources and guidance to the same. The coach also assists with academic MTSS support for planning interventions needed to assist struggling learners. In addition, the coach joins the Leadership Team in providing direct intervention support to students most in need of assistance (i.e. Tier 3).</p> <p>In addition to responsibilities to teachers and students, this coach serves as testing coordinator.</p>
Sotomayor Rodriguez, Paola	Reading Coach	<p>The reading coach provides mentoring and coaching support to the instructional staff, as needed. More intensive support is provided to new staff. This coach serves the ELA Program primarily; however, also assists with any member of the instructional staff in need of support. The coach maintains data, coordinates common and diagnostic assessments, participates in collaborative planning with grade-level content teams, and provides resources and guidance to the same. The coach also assists with academic MTSS support for planning interventions needed to assist struggling learners. In addition, the coach joins the Leadership Team in</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>providing direct intervention support to students most in need of assistance (i.e. Tier 3).</p> <p>In addition to her work with staff, this coach also serves as the primary instructional resource for English-Language Learner students (and families).</p>
Downing, Sean	Principal	<p>I am responsible for leading all aspects of the educational and business functions at Prairie Lake Elementary School, a comprehensive Pre-K to grade 5 public school. We have approximately 800 students and 75 employees. In addition to management and operational functions, I am responsible for ensuring that staff are implementing the instructional program, as set out by the Florida Department of Education. I walk classrooms to give formative and summative feedback for instruction. I sit in on weekly PLC meetings with grade levels. I lead the implementation of a PLC process on the Prairie Lake campus. I work collaboratively with the leadership team to plan for improvement and will conduct data discussions at the school, grade, and individual teacher levels. When appropriate, I will support teachers and members of the leadership team through coaching. I report to stakeholders and work with the district, parents, and the community on a regular basis.</p>
Cox, Bonnie	Dean	<p>The Dean manages the school's Behavior Program and serves on the Leadership Team to provide input and assistance in the development of responsive plans to support the maintenance of student connections to the Academic Program. The goal is to have each student pass their core classes and successfully advance to the next level. The Dean maintains data on student discipline referrals, school responses, and student (leveled) behavior plans. The Dean assists the Guidance Department in conducting threat assessments; specifically, threats made toward others. The Dean is also a critical participant in the development and management of student safety plans, as well as the school emergency preparation and response. The dean serves as the primary point of contact for the schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and support (PBIS) team initiative.</p>
Suba, Jasondra	Staffing Specialist	<p>The Staffing Specialist manages the ESE Program and advises and assists with MTSS at PLES. As a member of the school's MTSS Leadership and School Problem-Solving Teams, the Staffing Specialist schedules and facilitates planning meetings, supports the development of Behavior Intervention Plans, and collects and maintains important data. This person is essential in terms of ensuring good communication with parents and proper documentation of the ESE and MTSS efforts of the school.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Annually we conduct a staff debrief where we take the input of the staff, parents, and community members. As a part of that process, we utilize parent and staff surveys to ensure to include their input as part of the new School Improvement Plan. Using this input, we draft tentative goals and objectives. We hold public parental involvement meetings with school stakeholders prior to the school year to give feedback on the plan. After seeking that feedback, we will invite our School Advisory Committee to review the School Improvement Plan to give any last-minute adjustments. Pending approval of the SAC, we will utilize the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We utilize the benchmarks (including estimated timelines for implementation). As part of our regular administrative team meetings, we will regularly report out on the areas based on the person who is responsible. We will track the implementation and the data of the state benchmarks. This data will be reported out to the SAC monthly, and adjustments and reflections will be made as appropriate. A portion of the SIP will also be reported biweekly in a spotlight segment of the "The Panther Pulse" (parent newsletter).

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	6	33	31	38	33	26	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	5	7	4	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	55	40	0	0	0	97
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	45	47	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	55	40	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	45	47	0	0	0	94
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	28	32	55	0	0	0	0	130

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	11	11	60	39	0	0	0	127

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	39	30	49	20	43	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	3	46	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	19	45	0	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	5	40	38	0	0	0	0	0	84

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	6	30	48	26	49	0	0	0	160

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	39	30	49	20	43	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	3	46	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	19	45	0	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	5	40	38	0	0	0	0	0	84

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	6	30	48	26	49	0	0	0	160

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	46	57	53	48	56	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				61			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			27		
Math Achievement*	50	60	59	51	46	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				68			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			32		
Science Achievement*	60	63	54	57	61	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	42	59	59	42			50		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	243
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	25	Yes	4	4
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	60			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	69			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	3
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	50			
HSP	53			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	46			50			60					42
SWD	16			22			35				5	40
ELL	35			39			62				5	42
AMI												
ASN	50			69							2	
BLK	40			43			49				5	26
HSP	41			50			58				5	54
MUL	53			41							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	66			67			84				4	
FRL	41			41			57				5	43

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	48	61	44	51	68	61	57					42
SWD	13	31	20	23	50	43	20					
ELL	30	50	38	32	68	73	33					42
AMI												
ASN	56	70		81	80							
BLK	41	60	50	41	63	57	49					35
HSP	47	60	35	48	76	62	61					36
MUL	69			81								
PAC												
WHT	60	60		68	72		62					
FRL	41	57	48	42	64	63	49					35

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	45	27	43	42	32	53					50
SWD	15	0		21	17		8					
ELL	30	29		23	29		21					50
AMI												
ASN	71			59								
BLK	37	37	21	35	37	39	41					48
HSP	50	53		40	35		67					41
MUL	60			50								
PAC												
WHT	63	55		61	67		67					
FRL	37	30	23	33	33	33	35					42

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	48%	54%	-6%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	52%	-9%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	62%	-14%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	51%	7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Students with disabilities continue to trend below the 41% Federal Index for Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) with 13% proficiency, despite the score doubling from the prior year with 6% proficiency.

Contributing Factors for the Lowest Performance Include:

- Consistency across the ESE department with instruction and materials.
- Instructional delivery to include a combination of standards-based instruction and foundation deficiency instruction.
- Intentional common planning with grade-level teams and ESE instructors.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA proficiency (46%) which decreased 2% (48%) from the 2022 school year, and 1% (47%) from the 2021 school year.

Contributing Factors for the Lowest Performance Include:

- Lack of reading foundational skills (students).
- Intentional planning for ESSA subgroups (instructors).
- Consistent use of research-based literacy strategies (instructors).
- Consistent use of research-based materials for Tier II and Tier III (instructors).
- Consistent monitoring of intervention instruction (administration).

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 3rd-grade math with a 6% difference. Prairie Lake had an average score of 292 and the state with an average score of 300.

Contributing Factors Include:

- Maximization of math instructional time.
- Planned structured independent practice.
- Utilization of supplementary resources/data for intervention and reteaching.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was science with a 2023 proficiency of 58% from a 57% proficiency in the 2022 school year.

New Actions that were Taken Included:

- Two teachers were sent to district IMPACT training for math.
- Science coach provided support for lowest performing classes.
- Side-by-side teaching provided by administration for target science standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

According to the EWS data from Part I, there are potentially 60 students in 5th grade with two or more early warning indicators. During the 2022 school year, 55 students in 4th grade scored a level 1 on the FAST ELA.

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

- 1). SWD meeting ESSA
- 2). ELL meeting ESSA
- 3). Students with two or more Early Warning Indicators
- 4). Focus on students who achieved Level 1 in ELA
- 5). Focus on students who achieved Level 1 in Math

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

From 2021-2023, Students with Disabilities scored below the 41% Federal Index for ESSA. In 2022, Students with Disabilities scored 6% proficiency, while 2023 data showed an improvement of 7% percent (13%).

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students with Disabilities will increase their literacy skills through targeted reading activities and instruction on the student's lowest performed standards to develop their academic vocabulary, comprehension, and writing skills. Students' progress will be measured through common assessments and monitoring benchmarks including PM FAST and CRM assessments, to measure student proficiency. By May 2024, students with disabilities will increase their ELA proficiency to 41% as measured on the FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students with Disabilities will increase their literacy skills through targeted reading activities and instruction on the student's lowest performed standards to develop their academic vocabulary, comprehension, and writing skills. Students' progress will be measured through standards-based unit assessments (SBUA) and monitoring benchmarks including PM FAST 1, PM FAST 2, and PM FAST 3 to measure student proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Downing (sean.downing@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will create and implement differentiated instruction geared toward meeting the needs of each student. The Instructional leadership team will monitor data from common unit assessments, implementation of intervention programs, SIPP, which is a researched, evidenced-based intervention, ExactPath, Heggarty, and Successmaker. The instructional leadership team will support the development and implementation of small group instruction including push-in support. Additionally, the staffing specialist will work with teachers to ensure proper support services.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of the researched, evidence-based interventions listed above will allow our instructional staff to implement and monitor the progression of learning of students in both reading and math. Our goals for this year call for an increase in overall achievement. In order to accelerate learning to produce achievement, teachers need to be efficient in their instruction. Small group differentiation allows for instruction to be tailored to student needs. A focus on prerequisite skills will allow our lowest achieving students to gain the skills needed to better access the curriculum. Finally, a focus on independent practice will help both the students and teachers better understand the expectations of the benchmarks and better inform actions to improve prior to assessment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Step 1: Identify Students with Disabilities that are targeted for instruction with general education and special education teachers.

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

By When: Mid-September 2023.

Step 2: Analyze data based on 2022 FSAT PM3 and FAST PM1 2023 to determine students' areas of reading needs.

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

By When: End of September 2023.

Provide professional development for general education and special education teachers on reading instructional evidence-based instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Melanie Young (melanie.young@ocps.net)

By When: Beginning of October 2023.

Monitoring the progress of students with disabilities using SBUA and FAST PM2 data.

Person Responsible: Sean Downing (sean.downing@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students who had gaps in their learning prior to the pandemic have been disproportionately negatively impacted by shutdowns and exclusions. Traditional instructional practices tend to move from topic to topic and from standard to standard when the majority of the students demonstrate proficiency. Unfortunately, the students who do not demonstrate proficiency on a key standard may be repeated again and again, thus they fall farther and farther behind. Additionally, individual teachers in classrooms across and among grade levels are not systematic about which standards they determine to be essential, and the teacher in the classroom is not able to consistently define or measure what they determine proficiency looks like.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Grade-level teachers will work collaboratively with their grade-alike peers to implement a PLC process. This will include identifying essential standards, developing common formative assessments (to be used after the delivery of core instruction and one to be used after some form of intervention), and utilizing Walk to Intervention. As a result of these efforts, we will score above the district average for students scoring 70% or above on English and Math SBUs.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This will be monitored through direct observation (including walk-throughs) and data collection (performance on common formative assessments of essential standards, district-created common assessments, and progress monitoring three times a year).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Downing (sean.downing@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The staff of PLES will work to implement a PLC process over the 2023-2024 school year. As part of this implementation, PLES Team Leaders will conduct a book study on Learning by Doing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A functioning PLC will help boost collective efficacy for teachers. According to Hattie's effect size, teacher efficacy has a mean effect size of 1.57 (strong correlation to student achievement).

<https://visible-learning.org/2018/03/collective-teacher-efficacy-hattie/>

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional learning regarding the PLC process.

Person Responsible: Sean Downing (sean.downing@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Since the students returned from COVID, we have seen a dramatic increase in office disciplinary referrals (202 referrals logged in 2022-2023 SY), along with an increase in the number of students listed as truant. After formerly being a model positive behavioral interventions and support (PBIS) school, we "lost our way" and focused on that team. As we reformed our PBIS Team, we will work with our School Leadership Team and our stakeholders to focus on Tier 1 supports as they impact positive culture and student engagement. the SLT will utilize school discipline data and survey results to plan activities impacting the students and staff.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The school will conduct regular (at least monthly) PBIS meetings focused on data, while hosting regular (at least monthly) activities to teach positive, pro-social behaviors as well as implementing a systematic, schoolwide incentive program. We expect to see an 8% decrease in the number of office disciplinary referrals processed for the 2023-2024 school year (204 or fewer office disciplinary referrals for the 2023-2024 school year).

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The PLE SLT will conduct weekly meetings where we will monitor the implementation of the PBIS process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bonnie Cox (bonnie.cox2@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will be utilizing the Florida PBIS Project, a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) which refers to all of the instructional strategies, interventions, and other resources that are used to help all students achieve. This effective system blends contextually relevant academic and behavioral supports to create effective environments that address a range of student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Florida PBIS Project is a multi-tiered system of support that requires effective leadership, communication, capacity building, and data systems. Utilizing this continuous improvement model, we will be able to use data-based problem-solving to identify organizational changes to make their MTSS more effective.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Review schoolwide expectations around data systems, student behaviors, and a schoolwide incentive system. Form PBIS Team. Conduct initial schoolwide training with expectations. Schedule meetings. Conduct meetings. Schedule schoolwide incentives. Monitor data and communicate successes.

Person Responsible: Sean Downing (sean.downing@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly/ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Prairie Lake Elementary School is identified as a TSI school based on 2022-2023 school performance data, particularly with the performance of the Students with Disabilities subgroup. The staff at PLE will focus on Tier 1 instruction in foundational literacy/phonics instruction.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

The students at PLE in K-2 did not score in the range necessitating a RAISE goal, however, as early literacy is a necessary foundation, we will be utilizing the following practices: We will fully embed the practices within the IES Practice Guide, as we see it meets the ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 2nd Grade: We will also seek to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Finally, we will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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

Prairie Lake Elementary third-grade (indicator was 50%, Prairie Lake Elementary was at 45%) and fifth-grade (threshold was 50%, Prairie Lake Elementary was at 48%) students scored below the threshold established for RAISE, however, as literacy is essential for all we do, we will be utilizing the following practices in grade 3:

We will fully embed the practices within the IES Practice Guide Recommendations as they meet the ESSA strong level of evidence requirements. We will also seek to develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. We will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

For students in grades 4 and 5 specifically, we will focus on building students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words. We will provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly. We will routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. We will also:

- Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text.
- Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read.
- Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text.
- Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Fifty-five percent of students in Grades K-2 will score in the 40th percentile (or above) on the third progress monitoring assessment (STAR End of the Year).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Fifty-five percent of students in Grades 3-5 will score 3+ on the FAST End of the Year assessment.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators.

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Cadre leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Downing, Sean, sean.downing@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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. §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?

We will fully embed the practices within the IES Practice Guide, as we see it meets the ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 5th Grade.

Practice guide strategies meet ESSA's strong level of evidence:

-use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)

-Haggerty (Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters)

-SIPPS (teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, write and recognize words, and build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Our goals for this year call for an increase in student learning gains and overall achievement. In order to accelerate learning to produce learning gains and achievement, instruction will need to be efficient. Small group differentiation allows for instruction to be tailored to student needs. A focus on prerequisite skills will allow our lowest achieving students to gain the skills needed to better access the curriculum. We will be using Heggerty as it helps students develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. We will also use SIPPS as it teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. SIPPS also build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

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
Leadership will support teachers in implementing small group differentiated instruction through work in PLCs and through monthly differentiated professional learning opportunities.	Downing, Sean, sean.downing@ocps.net
Leadership will use principles of responsive facilitation to support and implement the cycles of professional learning (plan, implement, monitor, and modify). As part of this process, leadership will monitor the implementation of small-group differentiation strategies through observation and data analysis, provide targeted feedback to teachers for improvement and engage teachers in ongoing professional development within common planning times and instructional coaching cycles.	Downing, Sean, sean.downing@ocps.net
Leadership will lead professional learning on the Science of Reading, with information specific to foundational skills for Kindergarten through 2nd grade. This professional learning may occur in PLCs or during professional development times.	Downing, Sean, sean.downing@ocps.net

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes