

Lake County Schools

# Pine Ridge Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Pine Ridge Elementary School

10245 COUNTY ROAD 561, Clermont, FL 34711

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

## SIP Authority

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

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

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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 regular 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, and 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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shryock, Donna	Other	Provides site-based support and assistance to the school regarding best practices in mental wellness, identifying students at-risk for mental health challenges, and appropriately referring students with high/severe needs, collaborating with district and school-based mental health professionals in the problem solving process in regards to mental health/wellness, and supporting Zones of Regulation and Restorative Practice on Campus

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

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

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

The process of stakeholder involvement and SIP development is facilitated and initiated by the school leadership team. Leadership team members collaborate to analyze data and identify areas of focus and action plans to address these areas. The School Advisory Council (SAC) provides input and becomes involved in the SIP development process during monthly SAC meetings in which the SIP is reviewed. SAC members which include all required stakeholders provide input and ask questions for clarity as needed.

**SIP Monitoring**

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored through establishing checkpoints in which stakeholders will track fidelity of implementation, review impact on increasing student achievement, and will revise the plan as necessary. Our monthly SAC meetings (held on the 1st Wednesday of every month) will serve as our scheduled checkpoint dates which will allow all stakeholders to be involved in the monitoring to the SIP.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	39%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	69%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b>	ATSI



*updated as of 3/11/2024	
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	9	8	7	6	8	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	8	2	12	19	17	0	0	0	59
Course failure in Math	1	0	2	3	2	4	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	54	56	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	37	40	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	28	46	19	54	56	0	0	0	203

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	5	9	40	51	0	0	0	110

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	15	43	32	30	38	46	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	27	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	34	30	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	0	3	14	11	0	0	0	31

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	15	43	32	30	38	46	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	27	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	34	30	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	0	3	14	11	0	0	0	31

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	47	53	54	50	56	62		
ELA Learning Gains				46			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			43		
Math Achievement*	61	55	59	58	46	50	62		
Math Learning Gains				61			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	59	52	54	53	52	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					52	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	61	59						

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	10	Yes	2	2
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	56			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	46			

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	1	1
HSP	62			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	43			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	53			61			59					64
SWD	11			18			10				4	
ELL	42			58							3	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			45			40				4	
HSP	53			61			65				4	
MUL	38			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	55			62			61				4	
FRL	41			50			42				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	54	46	35	58	61	48	53					
SWD	18	34	26	18	39	37	8					
ELL	65	47		55	73		70					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	17		21	33	36	14					
HSP	54	46		61	77	70	63					
MUL	41			59								
PAC												
WHT	59	52	38	61	59	44	55					
FRL	42	41	32	38	55	55	36					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	62	52	43	62	52	41	71					
SWD	21	7		22	20		21					
ELL	37	36		47	55							

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			23								
HSP	53	38		63	52		67					
MUL	70			60								
PAC												
WHT	68	59	44	66	54	46	77					
FRL	49	42	43	45	39	50	60					

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	54%	4%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	50%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	62%	4%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	52%	8%	51%	9%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

ELA proficiency overall showed the lowest performance at 54%. Contributing factors include the change to state standards, implementation of new ELA curriculum, and vacant instructional positions during the year.

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

Overall ELA proficiency showed no growth from the prior year's data, remaining at 54%. Contributing factors include change to state standards, implementation of new ELA curriculum, and vacant positions during the school year.

**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.**

Local school data was above the state proficiency in all reporting categories with ELA proficiency at 54%, math proficiency at 65%, and Science proficiency at 59%.

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

In the area of math proficiency, data shows an increase of 7% points. Factors and new actions contributing to this improvement were the implementation of Number Talks which included Targeted Feedback Cycles, Learning Walks, Professional Development, establishing a school wide walk to intervention block, and model classrooms.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, one potential area of concern is students with one or more referrals. Analyzing this data closer, more than 50% of those students were students with IEPs.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. ELA Growth
3. Science Proficiency
4. Proficiency for Students with Disabilities

#### Area of Focus

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



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Overall ELA proficiency was the area that showed the least amount of growth when comparing 2022 to 2023 FAST results. Teachers will continue to 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)? Discussions and plans of action will specifically address how teachers will respond to students with disabilities who are not demonstrating mastery of essential standards, and 4. How will we respond when they already know it (acceleration opportunities & project-based learning)? Our guiding coalition of teacher leaders will continue to meet monthly with the purpose of leading the PLC process in the school and facilitating weekly professional learning for their grade-level teams. Our ESE professional learning team will be led by the ESE Specialist and meet monthly.

**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%. Proficiency for students with disabilities will be above 41%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring will occur through analysis of common formative assessments, BOY and MOY iReady diagnostics, and BOY and MOY FAST assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

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.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

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

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

**By When:** F.A.S.T. PM 3 (May 2024)

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)

**By When:** F.A.S.T. PM 3 (May 2024)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

A walk-to data-driven remediation and acceleration block will continue to 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. A tier 3 intervention schoolwide support system for students needing support in the five universal skills will be implemented within the master schedule including support in - 1. Reading: The ability to decode and comprehend text 2. Writing: The ability to convey ideas through the written word 3. Number Sense: The understanding of numbers, sequencing, and basic mathematical functions 4. English Language: The ability to comprehend and speak the native tongue of the school 5. Social and Academic Behaviors: A demonstration of basic social and academic behaviors. Intense interventions will be provided 4 days a week to students with disabilities.

**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, and additional research-based tier 3 schoolwide support system ELA and Math proficiency will increase by 8% and 4% respectively.

**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. Tier 3 data will be reviewed by our leadership team. 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 Intervention:**

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

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 STEAM.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 STEAM, has an effect size of 0.47.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### **Action Steps to Implement**

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

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, and STEAM 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)

**By When:** F.A.S.T. PM 3 (May 2024)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, there was an increase in the total number of referrals from 88 to 91. The number of days of out of school suspension increased from 22 to 47. 7% 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 maintain or decrease  
The number of days of out of school suspension 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 data  
Discipline Incident Data-OSS and ISS data  
Guidance & MHL Log-Student visits data  
Attendance Data -Tardy and absence data  
Course Failures- D/F course grade data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

An EWS team, called the Bear Necessities, will continue this school year 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 and interventions for this school year will include or involve zones of regulation lessons, restorative practices, student ambassador program, monitoring implementation of the 6 academic behaviors for students, check in and check out, and student incentives. The team will consist of administration, school counselors, MHL, and PASS teacher.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The positive culture and environment was identified as a crucial need based on EWS data reviewed. Specifically data related to out of school suspension more than double. An EWS team monitoring school wide data to identify students with Early Warning Systems indicators will allow for interventions to 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.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

Create a schedule for the 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)

**By When:** August 30, 2023.

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, the 6 academic behaviors, and Zones of Regulation around campus by displaying posters created using our Poster Maker and Laminator and adding poster to outdoor areas of our campus using poster display cases.

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

**By When:** Continuous through the school year