Multi-year School Support Plan

Division and School Information

Information Needed	Enter Information Below
School Year	2025-2026
Division Name	Prince William County Schools
Division Superintendent	LaTanya D. McDade, Ed. D.
School Name	Lake Ridge Elementary
Grades Served	PK-5
Principal Name	Abigail Martinez
Principal Email	martinae1@pwcs.edu
Division Multi-year School Support Plan Lead Name and Title	Dr. Maggie De La Rosa, Associate Superintendent, Central
Division Multi-year School Support Plan Lead Email	delarom@pwcs.edu

Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder Representation	Name	Email	Organization, Department, or Office	Title
School Leader	Abigail Martinez	martinae1@pwcs.edu	School	Principal
School Leader	Theresa Lewis	lewista@pwcs.edu	School	Assistant Principal
School Staff	Ana Batres	batresal@pwcs.edu	School	Parent Liaison
Teacher	Diana Johnson	johnsodp@pwcs.edu	School	School Counselor
Teacher	Phyllis Hardy-Coley	coleypx@pwcs.edu	School	Instructional Technology Coach
Teacher	Sarah Standard	standasa@pwcs.edu	School	Reading Specialist
Teacher	Ngan Ha	hank@pwcs.edu	School	ESOL Teacher
Teacher	Kimberly Greenfield	greenfkt@pwcs.edu	School	Gifted and Talented Teacher
Teacher	Brandon Milner	milnerba@pwcs.edu	School	Music Teacher
Teacher	Jessica Milom	milomjl@pwcs.edu	School	Kindergarten Teacher
Teacher	Ashley Baum	bauman@pwcs.edu	School	1st Grade Teacher
Teacher	Laura Van Houten	vanhoulk@pwcs.edu	School	2nd Grade Teacher
Teacher	Janelle Pace	paceje@pwcs.edu	School	3rd Grade Teacher
Teacher	Melissa Orenstein	orenstmp@pwcs.edu	School	4th Grade Teacher
Teacher	Shaun Page	pages@pwcs.edu	School	5th Grade Teacher
Teacher	Diane Madden	maddendm@pwcs.edu	School	Level 1 Special Education Teacher
Division Leader	Meisram Hernandez	figuerml@pwcs.edu	Strategic Planning and Continuous Improvement Department	Coordinator, Continuous Improvement Coaching
Division Leader	Haley Guglielmi	guglieh@pwcs.edu	Special Education Department	Administrative Coordinator Special Education
Division Leader	Tiffany Hardy	hardytd@pwcs.edu	Teaching and Learning Office	Director of Professional Development
Division Leader	Dr. Maggie De La Rosa	delarom@pwcs.edu	Elementary Level Office	Associate Superintendent, Central
Division Leader	Kathryn Forgas	forgaske@pwcs.edu	Elementary Level Office	Director of Elementary Schools, Central

Multi-year School Support Plan			
3-Year Goal Statement Include the goal statement completed as part of the needs assessment process.	Our current state in reading for students with disabilities is 34% proficiency on the reading SOL in June 2025. Our desired future state for our students with disabilities is 50% or more proficiency on the reading SOL by June 2028.		
School Performance and Support Framework Alignment Select indicator that the goal addresses.	Reading Mastery		
Measurable Objectives Define objectives that support accomplishing the goal.	**Measurable Objective Year 1**	**Measurable Objective Year 2**	**Measurable Objective Year 3**
	By June 2026, 40% or more of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency on the reading SOL. By June 2026, 40% or more of students with disabilities in grades 2-5 will be reading on/above grade level. By June 2026, 60% or more of students with disabilities in grades K-2 will score within the low-risk band of the VALLSS assessment.	By June 2027, 45% or more of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency on the reading SOL. By June 2027, 45% or more of students with disabilities in grades 2-5 will be reading on/above grade level. By June 2027, 70% or more of students with disabilities in grades K-2 will score within the low-risk band of the VALLSS assessment.	By June 2028, 50% or more of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency on the reading SOL. By June 2028, 50% or more of students with disabilities in grades 2-5 will be reading on/above grade level. By June 2028, 80% or more of students with disabilities in grades K-2 will score within the low-risk band of the VALLSS assessment.
Evidence-Based Strategy Describe the evidence-based strategy and the rationale for selection. Identify evidence tier.	**Evidenced-Based Strategies:** Decoding K-3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Comprehension 4-5: Routinely use a set of comprehension building practices to help students make sense of the text. **Description of Evidence-Based Strategies:** Decoding Recommendation 3: Teach students to blend letter sounds and sound–spelling patterns from left to right within a word to produce a recognizable pronunciation. Instruct students in common sound–spelling patterns. Teach students to recognize common word		

	parts. Have students read decodable words in isolation and in text. Teach regular and irregular high-frequency words so that students can recognize them efficiently. Comprehension Recommendation 3B: Routinely use a set of comprehension building practices to help students make sense of the text. Explicitly teach students how to find and justify answers to different types of questions. Teach students to ask questions about the text while reading. Learning to ask and answer questions will enable students with reading difficulties to integrate information from the passage with the knowledge they have gained from earlier lessons or their reading. These connections will enable students to draw text-based interpretations or inferences about what the author implied. By asking and answering questions about text, students can better interpret its meaning. **Rationale:** The comprehensive needs assessment included an analysis of three-year trend data (to include overall and student groups): SOL, Unit Assessments, PALS, VALLSS, and HMH Growth Measure. Root Cause protocol was used to determine root cause focused on the components of the instructional core. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent teacher implementation of decoding and comprehension strategies to increase student engagement at a high level of rigor. The team determined a strategic priority for increasing student achievement in reading for all (with a focus on students with disabilities). The team then discussed and selected evidence-based strategies that focused on improving students' decoding and comprehension skills. **Evidence Tier:** Tier 1 (strong evidence) for the above evidence-based strategies.
Intended Outcomes Describe how student outcomes will improve as a result implementing the evidence-based strategy.	**Intended Outcomes:** Students need to learn how to break down and read complex words by segmenting the words into pronounceable word parts. To do this, students must understand morphology. Learning to recognize letter patterns and word parts and understanding that sounds relate to letters in predictable and unpredictable ways will help students decode and read increasingly complex words. It will also help them to read with greater fluency, accuracy, and comprehension. As word recognition becomes easier, students can focus more on word meaning when they read, ultimately supporting reading comprehension. Learning to ask and answer questions will enable students, specifically students with disabilities with reading difficulties, to integrate information from the passage with the knowledge they have gained from earlier lessons or their reading. These connections will

	enable students to draw text-based interpretations or inferences about what the author implied. By asking and answering questions about text, students can better interpret its meaning. To help us achieve the intended outcomes above, we will provide teachers with professional development on explicitly teaching students, specifically students with disabilities how to decode and utilize comprehension building practices; growth producing feedback on instructional delivery and implementation of decoding and comprehension strategies; and monitoring students decoding and comprehension progress, which will increase our students with disabilities performance on the reading SOL.
Lead person (Who is responsible for ensuring the work gets done?)	School Principal and school Continuous Improvement (CI) Team
Team Members (Who are responsible for doing the work?)	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Specialist, CI Team, K-5 Teachers (General Education and Special Education Teachers)

Action Step *(What will be accomplished?)* List the specific, sequenced steps required to complete the activity.	**Process Owner** *(Who is responsible for ensuring the action step is complete?)* Identify a single, accountability lead.	**Time Frame** (*How long will it take?)* Identify the start and end dates for each action step, including any key milestones.	**Progress Checks** *(How will the team monitor progress?)* Define key dates to review process, make adjustments, and confirm the work remains on track.	**Measures of Success** *(How will the team know if the action step is complete?)* Define clear, observable indicators of completion.	**Cost Elements** *(What resources are needed to complete the action step?)*	**Funding Source** (Where will the money come from?)
Professional Learning: <u>Year 1</u> Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education teachers on Science of Reading (VLA, VALLSS, HMH Phonics) on how to implement and explicitly apply decoding strategies. <u>Year 2</u> Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education	Reading Specialist	8/13/2025–6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings	100% of teachers will explicitly teach foundational skills (decoding words, analyzing word parts, writing and recognizing words that build decoding skills) and create opportunities for students to practice skills.	None	None

teachers focused on explicit instruction in decoding, including modeling/think-alouds and providing real time corrective feedback based on frequent checks for understanding, and planning for specially designed instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities. <u>Year 3</u> Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education teachers focused on anticipating decoding breakdowns based on student cognitive and linguistic needs, and intentionally designing, delivering, and refining specially designed instruction during whole group and targeted small-group instruction.						
Planning: <u>Year 1</u> K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to collaboratively plan weekly foundational skills and phonic features that develop	School Administrator Reading Specialist	8/13/2025–6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings Monthly CLT meeting agendas School support visits	100% of teachers will explicitly teach foundational skills (decoding words, analyzing word parts, writing and recognizing words that build decoding skills) and create opportunities for	$12,742.53 to fund three full day CLT planning opportunities during contract hours for general education and special education teachers.	SIG funding requested

students' phonics and word-reading skills, including blending sounds, recognizing spelling patterns and word parts, reading decodable text, and efficiently identifying high-frequency words. <u>Year 2</u> K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to collaboratively plan and ensure foundational lessons are explicit, have opportunities for real time corrective feedback, and plan for specially designed instruction within Tier 1 instruction. <u>Year 3</u> K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to focus on anticipating students' decoding challenges based on student's needs and intentionally design whole group and targeted, explicit small group instruction.				students to practice skills.	$6,944.00 in reading materials and resources to support implementation of evidence-based strategies.	

Monitoring: Administrators will conduct ongoing instructional walkthroughs and facilitate peer observations to provide actionable feedback to general and special education teachers to support effective instruction in foundational skills with a focus on teacher-directed instruction for students with disabilities and adjust instruction based on student data.	School Administrators	8/13/2025 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings Administrative meetings	100% of teachers will explicitly teach foundational skills (decoding words, analyzing word parts, writing and recognizing words that build decoding skills) and create opportunities for students to practice skills.	None	None
Implementation: K-3 students will practice phonic features using decodables and dictated sentences during intentionally designed small group instruction and independent practice, with scaffolds and are adjusted based on real-time progress monitoring.	School Administrators Reading Specialist	8/13/2025 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings CLT meetings	100% of Foundational Skills observations will have students practicing with written and/or oral tasks that are aligned to targeted content and skills.	None	None
Monitoring: K-3 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to discuss students'	School Administrators Reading Specialist	8/13/2025 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings	100% of Foundational Skills observations will have students practicing with written and/or oral tasks that are aligned	None	None

UFLI progress monitoring quick check data to determine instructional next steps, including refining specially designed instruction and identifying students who are below grade level and VALLSS supports.			CLT meetings	to targeted content and skills.		
Professional Learning: <u>Year 1</u> Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education teachers on Science of Reading (VLA and HMH) on how to implement and apply comprehension building practices, to include explicit instruction, and checks for understanding. <u>Year 2</u> Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education teachers on designing and delivering specially designed instruction within the core instruction to support students who struggle with text complexity.	School Administrator Reading Specialist	8/13/2025–6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings Weekly CLT meetings School Reading Team meetings	100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to use details from texts to demonstrate their understanding and/or support their ideas to make meaning of what they read on oral and/or written tasks monitored monthly using the PWCS walkthrough tool.	None	None

Year 3 Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education teachers on using student response data in real time to evaluate effectiveness of planned scaffolds and instructional approaches, refine grouping, adjust levels of explicit instruction, and modify scaffolds as needed to support students with disabilities.						
Planning: Year 1 K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to collaboratively plan and discuss weekly comprehension building practices that focus on using details from text to make meaning of what students read. Year 2: K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to collaboratively plan	School Administrator Reading Specialist	8/13/2025–6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings Weekly CLT meetings School Reading Team meetings	100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to use details from texts to demonstrate their understanding and/or support their ideas to make meaning of what they read on oral and/or written tasks monitored monthly using the PWCS walkthrough tool.	Not an additional request but will use the $12,742.53 to fund three full day CLT planning opportunities during contract hours for general education and special education teachers and $6,944.00 in reading materials and resources to support implementation of evidence-based strategies.	SIG funding requested

specially designed instruction to include anticipating comprehension barriers, explicit use of scaffolds, and utilizing co-teaching structures, and targeted small group instruction. <u>Year 3</u> K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to focus on analyzing student data to plan for real-time refinement of student grouping and scaffolds within a lesson.						
Monitoring: Administrators will conduct ongoing instructional walkthroughs and facilitate peer observations to provide actionable feedback to general and special education teachers to support instructional delivery of comprehension best practices that require students to use details from texts demonstrate their understanding using	School Administrators	8/13/2025 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings Administrative meetings	100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to use details from texts to demonstrate their understanding and/or support their ideas to make meaning of what they read on oral and/or written tasks monitored monthly using the PWCS walkthrough tool.	None	None

the PWCS Reading Comprehension Walkthrough tool.						
Implementation: K-5 students (including students with disabilities) will demonstrate their comprehension skills by speaking, listening, reading and/or writing during whole group, small group, and independent practice by responding to high level questions using evidence/details from texts.	School Administrators	8/13/2025 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings Administrative meetings	100% of Reading Comprehension observations will have students doing the majority of the work (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) while using text evidence and topic-specific language in their responses.	None	None
Monitoring: K-3 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to monitor and discuss student data (by name and need) to make instructional decisions and identify students who need additional support in the area of comprehension.	School Administrators Reading Specialist	8/13/2025 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings CLT meetings	100% of Reading Comprehension observations will have students doing the majority of the work (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) while using text evidence and topic-specific language in their responses.	None	None

Multi-year School Support Plan

3-Year Goal Statement Include the goal statement completed as part of the needs assessment process.	Our current state in math for students with disabilities is 27.3% proficiency on the math SOL in June 2025. Our desired future state for our students with disabilities is 50% or more proficiency on the math SOL by June 2028.		
School Performance and Support Framework Alignment Select indicator that the goal addresses.	Math Mastery		
Measurable Objectives	**Measurable Objective Year 1**	**Measurable Objective Year 2**	**Measurable Objective Year 3**

Define objectives that support accomplishing the goal.	By June 2026, 34% or more of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency on the math SOL. By June 2026, 34% or more of students with disabilities in grades 1-5 students will meet or exceed performance on the EOY Momentum Assessment.	By June 2027, 42% or more of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency on the math SOL. By June 2027, 42% or more of students with disabilities in grades K-5 students will meet or exceed performance on the EOY Momentum Assessment. (Phase in Kindergarten)	By June 2028, 50% or more of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency on the math SOL. By June 2028, 50% or more of students with disabilities in grades K-5 students will meet or exceed performance on the EOY Momentum Assessment.
Evidence-Based Strategy Describe the evidence-based strategy and the rationale for selection. Identify evidence tier.	**Evidence-Based Strategy:** Math K-5: Use a well-chosen set of concrete and semi-concrete representations to support students' learning of mathematical concepts and procedures. **Description of Evidence-Based Strategy:** Math Recommendation 3: Provide students with concrete and semi-concrete representations that effectively represent the concept or procedure being covered. When teaching concepts and procedures, concrete and semi-concrete representations to abstract representations. Provide ample and meaningful opportunities for students to use representations to help solidify the use of representations as “thinking tools.” Revisit concrete and semi-concrete representations periodically to reinforce and deepen understanding of mathematical ideas. **Rationale:** The comprehensive needs assessment included an analysis of three-year trend data (to include overall and student groups): SOL and Unit Assessments. Root Cause protocol was used to determine root cause focused on the components of the instructional core. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent teacher implementation and use of the C-R-A approach to increase student engagement and mathematical understanding at a high level of rigor. The team determined a strategic priority for increasing student achievement in math for all (with a focus on students with disabilities). The team then discussed and selected an evidence-based strategy that focused on improving students' understanding of multiple representations to model ideas and procedures. **Evidence Tier:** Tier 1 (strong evidence)		

Intended Outcomes Describe how student outcomes will improve as a result implementing the evidence-based strategy.	**Intended Outcomes:** Students who struggle to learn mathematics need additional, focused instruction using representations to model mathematical ideas and procedures. This can be achieved by selecting representations carefully and connecting them explicitly to the abstract representations (mathematical notation). Additionally, providing multiple opportunities for students to utilize representations allows them to deeply understand and solve problems. To help us achieve the intended outcomes above, we will provide teachers with professional development on explicitly teaching students, specifically students with disabilities how to utilize concrete and semi-concrete representations (concrete-representational-abstract approach, C-R-A); growth producing feedback on instructional delivery and implementation of C-R-A; and monitoring students' progress, which will increase our students with disabilities performance on the math SOL.
Lead person (Who is responsible for ensuring the work gets done?)	School Principal and School Continuous Improvement (CI) Team
Team Members (Who are responsible for doing the work?)	Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Technology Coach, CI Team, K-5 Teachers (General Education and Special Education Teachers)

Action Step *(What will be accomplished?)* List the specific, sequenced steps required to complete the activity.	**Process Owner** *(Who is responsible for ensuring the action step is complete?)* Identify a single, accountability lead.	**Time Frame** *(How long will it take?)* Identify the start and end dates for each action step, including any key milestones.	**Progress Checks** *(How will the team monitor progress?)* Define key dates to review process, make adjustments, and confirm the work remains on track.	**Measures of Success** *(How will the team know if the action step is complete?)* Define clear, observable indicators of completion.	**Cost Elements** *(What resources are needed to complete the action step?)*	**Funding Source** (Where will the money come from?)
Professional Learning: <u>Year 1</u> Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education teachers will participate in division and school-based professional development on: • C-R-A approach	Instructional Technology Coach	8/13/25 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings	100% of math observations will have teachers provide hands-on tasks to create/connect multiple representations and ideas to probe thinking by asking higher level questions as evidenced by the PWCS math walkthrough tool.	None	None

• Asking higher level questions • Building Thinking Classroom • Student discourse <u>Year 2</u> Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education teachers focused on explicit instruction using the C-R-A approach, including modeling, guided practice, and planning for specially designed instruction to support students with disabilities as they transition from concrete to abstract representations. <u>Year 3</u> Professional learning for all K-5 general and special education teachers focused on using student response data (e.g., student work, discourse, formative assessments) to evaluate the effectiveness of concrete and semi-concrete representations and scaffolds to adjust						

instruction in real time.						
Planning: <u>Year 1</u> K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to collaboratively plan and discuss strategic higher-level questions and mathematical tasks that encourage critical thinking and student discourse using the C-R-A approach as well as identify clear learning intentions and success criteria for selected tasks. <u>Year 2</u> K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to collaboratively plan and intentionally select scaffolds that enable students to engage in grade-level higher order thinking questions and require the use of the C-R-A approach. <u>Year 3</u> K–5 general and special education teachers will use CLT	School Administrators Instructional Technology Coach	8/13/25 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings CLT meetings	100% of math observations will have teachers provide hands-on tasks to create/connect multiple representations and ideas to probe thinking by asking higher level questions as evidenced by the PWCS math walkthrough tool, with a focus on observing scaffolds to support increased student ownership.	Not an additional request but will use the $12,742.53 to fund three full day CLT planning opportunities during contract hours for general education and special education teachers $5,806.49 in math materials and resources to support implementation of evidence-based strategy.	SIG funding requested

meetings to collaboratively refine instruction by analyzing students' response data and adjusting instructional supports as needed to ensure that students with disabilities consistently engage in grade-level reasoning, explanation, and academic discussion with increasing independence.						
Monitoring: Administrators will conduct instructional walkthroughs and facilitate peer observations to provide actionable feedback to general and special education teachers to support instructional delivery of C-R-A and high-level questioning using the PWCS Math Walkthrough tool with a focus on explicit instruction and scaffolds to support increased student ownership.	School Administrators	8/11/2025 – 6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings Administrative meetings	100% of math observations will have teachers provide hands-on tasks to create/connect multiple representations and ideas to probe thinking by asking higher level questions as evidenced by the PWCS math walkthrough tool, to include a focus on explicit instruction and scaffolds to support increased student ownership.	None	None
Implementation: K-5 general and special education teachers will provide	School Administrators Instructional Technology Coach	9/2/2025-6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings	100% of math observations will have students demonstrating or	None	None

students with clear and explicit success criteria on: • Demonstrating or justifying thinking using the C-R-A approach • How to use success criteria to self-monitor their learning			School CI Team meetings CLT meetings	justifying their learning through verbal or written tasks using C-R-A as evidenced by the PWCS math walkthrough tool.		
Monitoring: K-5 general and special education teachers will utilize CLT meetings to monitor and discuss student data (by name and need) to make instructional decisions and identify students who need additional supports.	School Administrators	9/2/2025-6/2028	BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring meetings School CI Team meetings CLT meetings	100% of math observations will have students demonstrating or justifying their learning through verbal or written tasks using C-R-A as evidenced by the PWCS math walkthrough tool.	None	None