Lake County Schools

Pine Ridge Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/1/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Pine Ridge Elementary School

10245 COUNTY ROAD 561, Clermont, FL 34711

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

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.

Every student, every day, achieves high levels of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A safe, inclusive, and collaborative school community that has high expectations for all students, and supports, engages, and celebrates learners

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Voytko, Corrie	Principal	leads the team, monitors and communicates data results to all stakeholders, attends MTSS meetings, engages in and facilitates targeted feedback cycles with leadership team, completes daily learning walks to provide non-evaluative feedback to teachers, manages regular communication with staff and community through newsletters, SchoolMessenger System, email, scheduled meetings, and social media, and serves as a Common Collaborative Planning Facilitator.
Burns, Natasha	Assistant Principal	responsible for discipline and safety, engages in targeted feedback cycles, Common Collaborative Planning Facilitator, attends MTSS meetings, completes daily learning walks and provides non-evaluative feedback to teachers.
Meinhart, Randi	Reading Coach	serves on MTSS team, provides assistance to teachers with ELA curriculum, provide small group instruction to bottom quartile students, engages in targeted feedback cycles, serves as a Common Collaborative Planning Facilitator, provides professional development and coaching related to independent daily reading with conferring
Meneses, Shelly	Curriculum Resource Teacher	leads Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math initiatives, School Communication (Facebook, Twitter, etc.), maintains school website, assists Assessment Coordinator, Common Collaborative Planning Facilitator, provides assistance to teachers, serves as technology contact
Townsend, Vanessa	Other	Common Collaborative Planning facilitator, engages in targeted feedback cycles with instructional staff, leads Zones of Regulation, restorative practices, data, scheduling, interventions
Livorsi, Kelly	SAC Member	Serves as SAC chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Corrie Voytko

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

810

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

16

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	111	92	112	142	134	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	6	8	14	16	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	6	19	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	1	0	7	1	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/11/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	88	103	112	107	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	1	0	1	0	1	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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	88	103	112	107	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	1	0	1	0	1	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	

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				74%	58%	57%	71%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	57%	58%	57%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	49%	53%	41%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				80%	60%	63%	77%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	56%	62%	71%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	39%	51%	49%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				69%	54%	53%	68%	55%	55%

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**
03	2021					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	60%	15%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	70%	59%	11%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	77%	62%	15%	62%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	61%	20%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	78%	57%	21%	60%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady K-5 Fall, Winter
iReady K-2 Spring
FSA 3-5 Spring
Science District LSA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	31	64
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	34	64
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	57	77
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	40	74
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60	69	53
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	33	59
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	51	63
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24	40	59
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49	54	70
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	57	69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	81	71
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

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	21	7		22	20		21				
ELL	37	36		47	55						
BLK	35			23							
HSP	53	38		63	52		67				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	68	59	44	66	54	46	77				
FRL	49	42	43	45	39	50	60				

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				

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
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				
FRL	65	55	38	68	65	42	66				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	65
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	59
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

High overall proficiency in ELA, Math, Science, decreases in overall learning gains and LQ gains for ELA and Math

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math and ELA LQ gains

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

Inconsistent small group instruction, inconsistent structure for collaborative planning - a need to address PLC Question - How do we collaboratively respond when students don't learn? No walk-to intervention system; Actions to be taken include increased student talk and collaboration, implementation of a walk-to intervention system, structured common collaborative planning, and targeted feedback practices.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The only area showing improvement was science proficiency.

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

Use of Science Bootcamp materials

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

Walk-to interventions, Addressing 4 PLC questions during common collaborative planning

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.

PD on becoming a PLC and addressing 4 PLC questions during collaborative planning, Number Talks PD, IDR with Conferring PD

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

tutoring, Leveled Literacy Intervention, SIPPS, weekly structured collaborative planning focused on 4 PLC questions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall math learning gains and LQ math learning gains were the two areas that showed the greatest decline when comparing 2019 FSA results to 2021 FSA results. Teachers will receive professional development related to the use of Number Talks in the math classrooms to promote student discussion, make thinking visible, and connect to collaborative learning within the district's instructional framework.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of using the Number Talks strategies consistently and effectively, overall FSA math gains will increase by 10% and LQ math gains will increase by 9%.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will occur through analysis of common district-created math assessments, BOY and MOY iReady diagnostics, and quarterly student math grades.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shelly Meneses (menesess@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Number Talks are daily conversations around computation and number sense which elicit specific strategies and thinking, focus on number relationships and theory. Number Talks allow students to solve mental math accurately, efficiently and flexibly while sharing, defending, collectively reasoning and building connections to concepts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students are engaged in Number Talks, they learn to invent, construct and make sense of mathematical concepts. The strategy allows students to combine content and math practice standards while voicing learning and understanding. They receive real-time feedback, leading to improved performance in math. Number Talks support the collaborative learning component of the district framework.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide Number Talks PD to instructional staff

Person Responsible	Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Meet weekly in grade level collaborative teams to respond to the 4 PLC Questions and review common assessment data to determine success of Number Talks instructional strategy

Person Responsible	Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Conduct learning walks during Number Talks instruction and provide feedback

Person Responsible	Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Zones of regulation lessons will be taught to all students across campus. This will provide all students with strategies to recognize their emotional state and control those actions that can be associated with certain emotions, and help their overall problem solving. A positive school culture and enhancing pro-social relationships among students will increase student success and increase teacher retention by creating a community that supports students' academic skills in addition to their social and emotional well-being.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of implementing school-wide lesson on the Zones of regulation language, there will be an increase in problem solving of peer conflicts among students and a reduction of school suspensions by 15%.
Monitoring:	Our PBS committe, facilitated by our PASS teacher will conduct a monthly review of discipline data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vanessa Townsend (townsendv@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Zones of regulation is a cognitive behavior approach that categorizes emotions into four color coded zones that helps students better understand their emotions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Being aware of one's emotions and controlling those actions that can result from specific emotions can improve our overall relationship with other. Hattie's meta-analysis, positive peer influences have an effect size of .53 and teacher-student relationships have an effect size of .52.

Action Steps to Implement	
Pre-planning overview of Zone of Regulation.	
Person Responsible	Vanessa Townsend (townsendv@lake.k12.fl.us)
Mini-lessons centered on Zones of Regulation on the morning announcements.	
Person Responsible	Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)
Use available funds to support recognizing students for positive behavior. Use available funds to purchase a poster maker to post BEAR expectations and Zones of regulation.	
Person Responsible	Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A walk-to data driven remediation and acceleration block will be implemented to increase learning gains throughout grade levels. Students will be grouped to address specific academic areas of need.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of daily intervention and acceleration, ELA and Math learning gains as measured by FSA will show an increase by 4% across our student population.
Monitoring:	Data, including iReady diagnostic results and common assessment results will be monitored regularly through grade level collaborative planning time. The Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) will be administered to students at the beginning, middle, and end of the year to assess students' reading levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	When students' learning difficulties are identified, corrected and reinforced as early as possible, cognitive gains increase. When students are given opportunities to accelerate their learning in collaborative groups and engage in discussion, their problem-solving skills and higher-order thinking positively impacts their academic performance within the classroom and during extra-curricular activities, such as Robotics and STEAM.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on Hattie's meta-analysis, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29. Acceleration has an effect size of 0.68. Integrated curricular programs, such as Robotics and STEAM, has an effect size of 0.47.

Action Steps to Implement

Use available funding to provide targeted small group after-school tutoring for students.
Secure and utilize research-based materials during daily intervention periods including SIPPS, LLI, Science Bootcamp, STEAM, and Robotics materials.
Provide opportunities for students to participate in acceleration programs within the classroom and through extracurricular programs, such as Robotics and STEAM.

Person Responsible	Corrie Voytko (voytkoc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

PRE was ranked third in the county for least amount of school suspensions. 0.1 incidents were reported for every 100 students. There were 19 reported suspensions in 2019 so will monitor in-school and out of school suspensions and the reason for the suspensions.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

The goal is for all staff members to foster positive relationships with students, among peers, and with each other. Having a consistent, shared vision at Pine Ridge Elementary and sharing that with all stakeholders through SAC and PTO meetings, as well as being posted on our school website is another way we build a positive school culture. Fostering relationships with all stakeholders through regular communication of both our academic and socio-emotional goals for our school while building school-home connections all year long helps build a positive school culture and environment and ensures all stakeholders are involved.

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

Pine Ridge Elementary Faculty and Staff - Communicate with parents, build relationships with students
Parents - Maintain open communication with staff, reinforce learning at home, speak positively of school and school staff, attend school wide events
Students - Follow the BEAR expectations (Be prepared, eager to learn, accept responsibility, respect everyone)

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00