

Lake County Schools

Pine Ridge Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 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: 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 69% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |

* 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| 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>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">69%</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;">39%</p> |

School Grades History

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

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 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, School Messenger System, email, scheduled meetings, and social media, and serves as a Professional Learning Teams (PLT) 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. |
| Townsend, Vanessa | 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 |
| 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 |
| Porcher, Sarah | Other | Common Collaborative Planning facilitator, engages in targeted feedback cycles with instructional staff, leads Zones of Regulation, restorative practices, data, scheduling, interventions |
| Chen, Sheri | School Counselor | testing coordinator, student small group and one on one counseling, guidance lessons, parent communication and support |
| Hudkins, Melissa | School Counselor | testing coordinator, student small group and one on one counseling, guidance lessons, parent communication and support |
| Brokaw-Klewitz, Cynthia | Other | As the ESE School Specialist, Mrs. Brokaw coordinates the collection of all necessary documentation prior to a student being considered for eligibility under an ESE program and/or service. She coordinates the referral, staffing, placement and re-evaluation process for exceptional student education at the school level. She acts as a resource to the school personnel regarding ESE rules, regulations, compliance requirements, program needs, school responsibilities, positive behavioral supports, discipline concerns, functional behavior assessments, behavior intervention plans, and other ESE related concerns. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Corrie Voytko

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

760

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

5

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 103 | 128 | 112 | 125 | 133 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 732 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 43 | 32 | 30 | 38 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 52 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 |

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/5/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 0 |

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 | 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 54% | 50% | 56% | | | | 74% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 46% | | | | | | 62% | 57% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | | | | | | 52% | 49% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 58% | 46% | 50% | | | | 80% | 60% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | | | | | | 66% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | | | | | | 52% | 39% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 53% | 52% | 59% | | | | 69% | 54% | 53% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 60% | 16% | 58% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 60% | 15% | 58% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 59% | 11% | 56% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -75% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 77% | 62% | 15% | 62% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 81% | 61% | 20% | 64% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -77% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 78% | 57% | 21% | 60% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -81% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 56% | 14% | 53% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 18 | 34 | 26 | 18 | 39 | 37 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 65 | 47 | | 55 | 73 | | 70 | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 17 | | 21 | 33 | 36 | 14 | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 46 | | 61 | 77 | 70 | 63 | | | | |
| MUL | 41 | | | 59 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 52 | 38 | 61 | 59 | 44 | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 41 | 32 | 38 | 55 | 55 | 36 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 51 |
| 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 | 355 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 26 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 62 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 25 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 62 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 50 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|--|-----|
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 53 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 43 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

Decrease in overall ELA proficiency along with ELA learning gains for all students including students in the lowest quartile. Overall math learning gains increased along with math LQ learning gains. Science proficiency decreased 18%. Third grade proficiency stayed within a 3% range of the previous year. Fourth grade proficiency decreased by 6% in ELA, but fourth grade math proficiency increased by 1%. Learning gains for fourth grade math and LQ learning gains for math were both at or above 60%. 5th grade ELA proficiency decreased 30%, and 5th grade math decreased 20%. There is a 1% decreased in overall ELA gains for 5th grade. Last year, 5th grade dropped 9% overall for learning gains. Math overall learning gains for 5th grade increased 1%. ELA LQ for fifth grade decreased 18%. Math LQ for fifth grade decreased 11%.

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

The greatest need for improvement is ELA and Math LQ learning 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?

Fidelity across all grade levels and all teachers in implementing new ELA curriculum, implementation gaps, learning curve implementing a new ELA curriculum, and new state standards were factors contributing to this need for improvement. New actions that would need to be taken to address this need for improvement include establishing a guiding coalition, re-establishing an EWS team to analyze EWS data and respond regularly, providing PD for BEST standards, new curriculum, and the PLC process.

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

Data that showed the most improvement overall math learning gains and math LQ learning gains.

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

Factors and new actions contributing to this improvement were implementation of Number Talks which included Targeted Feedback Cycles, Learning Walks, Professional Development, establishing a school-wide walk to intervention block, and Modeled classrooms.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning include implementation and monitoring of schoolwide walk-to intervention system and consistently addressing the 4 PLC questions during Professional Learning Team (PLT) meetings

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.

Walk-to interventions, becoming more proficient in addressing the 4 PLC questions during common collaborative planning, PD in BEST standards and the district framework.

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

Continued PD on the PLC process, establishing a guiding coalition to guide the journey of our collaborative teams as we work to fulfill our mission as a school, implementing tutoring and intervention.

Areas of Focus

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

:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Overall ELA learning gains and ELA LQ gains were the two areas that showed the greatest decline when comparing 2021 to 2022 FSA results. Teachers will receive job-embedded professional development weekly during collaborative planning time using the 4 PLC questions to drive the work - 1. What do we want students to know and be able to do (essential standards)? 2. How will we know when they've learned it (using the district framework to plan instruction and common formative assessments)? 3. How will we collectively respond when they don't learn (interventions)? and 4. How will we respond when they already know it (acceleration opportunities & project based learning)? A guiding coalition of teacher leaders will be formed and will meet biweekly with the purpose of leading the PLC process in the school and facilitating weekly professional learning for their grade level teams.

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

As a result of engaging in ongoing, weekly job-embedded professional development focused on the four PLC questions, ELA proficiency will increase by 10%, ELA LQ gains will increase by 19%, ELA and math achievement of students with disabilities will increase by 12%, ELA achievement of Black/African American students will increase by 11% and math achievement by 19%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through analysis of common formative assessments, BOY and MOY iReady diagnostics, and BOY and MOY FAST assessments for the desired outcome of ELA proficiency increasing by 10% and ELA LQ gain increasing by 19%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

A PLC is an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research. Three big ideas drive the work, including a Focus on Learning, Collaborative Culture, and Results Orientation. To focus the collaborative efforts of the team and achieve higher levels of learning for all students, there are four questions that drive the work of a PLC.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

PLCS operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators. When teachers engage in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research and make data-based decisions, they achieve better results for the students they serve. According to Hattie's visible learning chart, collective efficacy has a 1.57 effect size and help from peers has a 0.83 effect size.

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.

Create a guiding coalition of teacher leaders to lead the PLC process. Meet biweekly with guiding coalition to provide PD related to the PLC progress, share progress and celebrations, and work together to create solutions to challenges that arise.

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

Meet weekly in professional learning teams to respond to the 4 PLC questions, including the review of common formative assessment data, district data, and state data to determine student success on essential standards

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Signs

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

During the 2021-2022 school year, there was an increase in the total number of referrals from 56 to 88. The number of students with multiple referrals increased from 9 to 16. 32% of students had absence rates above 10%.

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

Absent rates above 10% will decrease by 16%.
 The number of total referrals will decrease by 15%.
 The number of students with multiple referrals will decrease by 25%.

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

The Bear Necessities Team will meet biweekly to review the following data sources:
 PAWS Report Data
 Discipline Incident Data
 Guidance & MHL Log
 Attendance Data
 Course Failures

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

An EWS team, called the Bear Necessities, will be created to specifically monitor EWS data and intervene when students exhibit one or more early warning signs. The team will meet biweekly to examine data and discuss next steps. Team next steps may include or involve zones of regulation lessons, restorative practices, student ambassador program, and student incentives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If an EWS team is created in order to identify Early Warning Systems early, interventions can be provided to reduce discipline incidents, improve attendance rates, and raise student achievement. According to Hattie's meta-analysis, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29, Behavioral Intervention Programs has an effect size of .62, and Self-regulation Strategies has an effect size of .52.

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.

Create an EWS team that consists of an administrator, school counselors, PASS Teacher, Mental Health Liaison, and ESE Specialist.

Person Responsible Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)

The EWS team (Bear Necessities) will hold biweekly meetings to review EWS data and plan interventions. The team will also promote good attendance, PBIS expectations, and Zones of Regulation around campus by displaying posters created using our Poster Maker and Laminator.

Person Responsible Natasha Burns (burnsn@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

A walk-to data-driven remediation and acceleration block will be implemented in grades K-5 to increase proficiency and learning gains. Students will be grouped to address specific academic areas of needs related to essential standards.

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

As a result of daily intervention and acceleration, ELA and Math proficiency will increase by 8% and 4% respectively. ELA and Math gains will increase by 8% and 5% respectively. ELA LQ and Math LQ gains will increase by 19% and 6% respectively. ELA and Math achievement will increase by 12% for students with disabilities. ELA achievement of Black/African American students will increase by 11% and math achievement by 19%.

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

Data, including iReady diagnostic results, common formative assessment results, and FAST assessment results will be monitored regularly during weekly grade level professional learning team meetings. The Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) and SIPPS placement test will be administered to students at the beginning, middle, and end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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 classroom within the classroom and during extra-curricular activities, such as Robotics and STEAM.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Based on Hattie's Visible Thinking 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
 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.

Use available funding to provide targeted small group after-school tutoring for students. Secure and utilize research-based materials during daily intervention, including SIPPS, LLI, Science Boot Camp, WriteScore, 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)

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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 school culture and environment.

Natasha Burns - Assistant Principal
Melissa Hudkins- School Counselor
Sheri Chen- School Counselor
Donna Marie Shryock- Mental Health Liaison
Sarah Porcher - PASS Teacher