

Lake County Schools

Pine Ridge Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Ridge Elementary School

10245 COUNTY ROAD 561, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://pre.lake.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Corrie Voytko

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2018-19 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pine Ridge Elementary School

10245 COUNTY ROAD 561, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://pre.lake.k12.fl.us//>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">56%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">29%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

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.

We encourage our children to reach their highest potential through challenging instruction, character education, parent involvement and community support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Pine Ridge Vision is "Striving to personalize instruction to support students as they realize their full potential through active engagement."

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Obando, Laine	Principal	Maintain campus safety and security, support teachers and students, maintaining high expectations for student achievement, monitor School Improvement plan implementation, communication school goals and focus
Burns, Natasha	Assistant Principal	Maintain campus safety and security, support teachers and students, maintaining high expectations for student achievement, monitor School Improvement plan implementation, communicating school goals and focus

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Number of students enrolled	113	141	116	132	132	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	

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	5	2	9	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

54

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	21	15	19	10	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	8	4	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	21	15	19	10	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	16	19	35	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	21	26	14	24	34	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	74%	58%	57%	70%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	57%	58%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	49%	53%	44%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	60%	63%	77%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	56%	62%	65%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	39%	51%	49%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	53%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	113 (0)	141 (0)	116 (0)	132 (0)	132 (0)	130 (0)	764 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (21)	0 (15)	0 (19)	0 (10)	0 (13)	0 (22)	0 (100)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (3)	5 (5)	8 (9)	14 (17)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	60%	16%	58%	18%
	2018	76%	61%	15%	57%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	60%	15%	58%	17%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	70%	59%	11%	56%	14%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	62%	15%	62%	15%
	2018	74%	65%	9%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	61%	20%	64%	17%
	2018	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	78%	57%	21%	60%	18%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	44	46	43	53	67	50	38				
ELL	61	56	61	73	72	56	36				
BLK	64	58		70	72		50				
HSP	69	70	60	83	74	69	58				
MUL	80			70							
WHT	77	60	49	81	63	43	75				
FRL	64	59	50	67	58	53	57				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	28	17	45	49	41	10				
ELL	55	33		64	58						
ASN	60			70							
BLK	64	59	50	67	61	55	57				
HSP	70	52	31	73	67	40	58				
MUL	73			64							
WHT	73	57	39	81	74	51	72				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	65	55	38	68	65	42	66				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	32	38	35	43	42	32	17				
ELL	35			65							
BLK	68	65		76	71		54				
HSP	58	54	50	63	50	47	27				
MUL	80			73							
WHT	73	61	43	81	68	47	61				
FRL	64	54	40	71	59	45	49				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	63
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA showed the lowest performance. Overall gains grew from 41 to 52%, however we continue to fall below the state average in this category.

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

5th grade math achievement declined within the cohort by 3% from the previous year. Professional development needs and school goals centered around ELA growth in 2019. This may be a contributing factor to the decline within the cohort.

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.

ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% showed the greatest gap. While performance falls below the state average, we continue to close the gap. Lack of systematic phonics instruction may contribute to the gap.

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

5th grade ELA showed the most improvement, increasing proficiency by 8%. Learning gains in ELA went from 57 to 62% and 41 to 52% within the lowest 25%. One new action included providing daily time for independent reading with teacher led conferring.

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

Attendance rates will be monitored monthly to help ensure that students missing 10% or more of days have appropriate supports in place including a plan to support regular attendance.

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

1. ELA learning gains for SWD.
2. Math learning gains for the lowest 25%.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	The faculty and staff will promote and strengthen positive school culture and enhance pro-social relationships within the school community.
Rationale	A positive school culture and enhancing pro-social relationships among students will increase student success by creating a community that supports students' academic skills in addition to their social and emotional well-being. Pine Ridge earned recognition as a PBiS model school from the University of South Florida in relation to the strong systems of positive behavioral support and Multi-Tiered System of Supports to meet the needs of students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a result of implementing daily proactive community building circles and school-wide use of restorative language, there will be an increase in positive school culture and will reduce out of school suspensions by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Restorative Practice
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on Hattie's meta-analysis, positive peer influences have an effect size of .53 and teacher-student relationships have an effect size of .52.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School counselors will deliver character development and self-empowerment lessons for school success during Wonderful Wednesday. 2. Using Early Warning Sign data, the Positive Alternative to School Suspension teacher and mental health liaison will facilitate implementation of school-wide community circles and restorative language. 3. Using Early Warning Sign data, the Positive Alternative to School Suspension teacher and mental health liaison will identify and support students in need of tier two and tier three behavioral interventions.
Person Responsible	Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Instructional staff will implement data-driven remediation and acceleration during the "Level Up" block to support learning gains in ELA.
Rationale	In order to support learning gains by all students, protected time must be provided for teachers to remediate and enrich student achievement based on individual needs. From 2018 to 2019, overall proficiency in ELA grew from 71 to 74%. Learning gains grew from 57 to 62% and learning gains of the lowest quartile grew from 41 to 52%. While these trends are positive across all areas, learning gains of the lowest quartile remain a focused goal for improving student achievement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a result of daily Level Up remediation and enrichment, we expect FSA learning gains for the ELA lowest quartile to increase by 4%. Learning gains overall will grow by 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Response to Intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on Hattie's meta-analysis, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29. Supporting our students with research-based intervention will help increase individual learning gains.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protected Level Up remediation/enrichment block at least 4 days per week. 2. iReady professional development to help teachers group students by academic profile in order to support individual needs. 3. Use weekly collaborative planning meeting to discuss student achievement results and determine areas of focus. 4. Include CRT, literacy coach, mental health liaison, and PASS teacher in intervention. 5. Literacy Coach will continue to provide professional development to support research-based best practice in ELA. 6. Use SAI funds to provide small group tutoring for 3rd-5th grade students performing in the lowest 25% in math and reading. The purpose of this tutoring will be to provide additional opportunities for remediation and support for students.
Person Responsible	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Instructional staff will facilitate students with consolidating their understanding of the content and exploring opportunities to problem solve, discuss and negotiate thinking through productive tasks with their peers.
Rationale	Research shows that classroom discussion and collaboration will yield improved student achievement across content areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a result of daily accountable collaboration across content areas, we expect FSA learning gains for ELA and math lowest quartile to increase by 4%. Learning gains overall will grow by 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Accountable collaboration will be monitored through reviewing data gained through the learning walk tool. Leadership team members will have feedback cycles with teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on Hattie's meta-analysis, accountable collaboration has an effect size of .82. Facilitating opportunities for our students to consolidate their understanding of content through discussion and productive tasks will help increase individual learning gains.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial PD 8/2019-Introducing accountable collaboration 2. Instruction framework coaching and support in collaborative team meetings 3. Learning walks and learning walk debrief/data analysis weekly 4. Coaching cycles
Person Responsible	Laine Obando (obandol@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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