Glen Springs Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Glen Springs Elementary School

2826 NW 31ST AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

https://www.sbac.edu/glensprings

Demographics

Principal: Ricky Bell   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * 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 Alachua 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.](http://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

Glen Springs Elementary School

2826 NW 31ST AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

https://www.sbac.edu/glensprings

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

The Mission of Glen Springs Elementary School is to academically enrich all of our students and foster social skills to promote successful lifelong learners in a caring, safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Glen Springs Elementary is that all students will leave our school with
-the skills needed to be successful citizens
-a strong self-esteem
-high expectations
-respect for others
-and a desire to continue the quest for knowledge

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Feagin, Deanna	Principal	Principal serves as the instructional leader and practices shared decision making by: Assessing, evaluating, and monitoring specific and measurable goals for the instructional and learning needs of the school, teachers and students. She practices shared decision making by encouraging faculty and staff members to communicate with the leadership team, work collaboratively to plan meaningful and aligned lessons and activities; as well as, analyze data.
Armstrong, Amanda	School Counselor	School Counselor serves as a school leader and practices shared decision making by: Provides Response to Intervention coordination across grade levels, leads and manages student Individual Educational Plans/ 504s and Educational Planning team meetings. Support for content area and grade level teachers in understanding progress monitoring strategies within multiple measures of data collected.
Zinger, Mary	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal serves as an instructional leader and practices shared decision making by: Facilitating professional development learning for teachers that align with our school goals and needs of our students. Additionally, she also provides meaningful and specific evidence based feedback to teachers following informal classroom walk-through and evaluations. Lastly, she serves as a a support for content area and grade level teachers in understanding and aligning the standards to instructional practice.
Floyd, Matthew	Dean	Dean of Students serves as a school leader and practices shared decision making by: Providing professional development in the area of behavior management and specific targeted interventions based on student needs. She also serves as the school based attendance liaison who is responsible for monitoring student attendance, facilitating educationally planning team meetings as it relates and communicating with the District truancy officer if needed.
Logan, Nancy	Other	Title I and Florida Continuous Improvement Model Coordinator serves as a school leader

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and practices shared decision making by: providing remediation to students who, based on state assessment data, are in the lowest quartile in reading and math. She also facilitates data meetings across grade levels to engage in shared discussion about student growth and academic needs; as well as, targeted interventions.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	86	77	76	79	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	10	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	4	12	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	1	3	10	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
35

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/19/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	4	8	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	12	24	36	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	9	5	6	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	59%	57%	58%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	57%	58%	60%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	49%	53%	42%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	60%	63%	62%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	61%	62%	51%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	49%	51%	34%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	57%	53%	45%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	79 (0)	86 (0)	77 (0)	76 (0)	79 (0)	80 (0)	477 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	7 ()	10 ()	11 ()	3 ()	4 ()	37 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	10 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 ()	2 (0)	4 (0)	12 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	27 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)	20 (0)	35 (0)

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison	10%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
05	2019	43%	55%	-12%	56%	-13%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison	-20%					
Cohort Comparison	-8%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	58%	12%	62%	8%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	60%	2%	64%	-2%
	2018	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison	-10%					
05	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
	2018	58%	61%	-3%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	55%	-4%	53%	-2%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	33	33	31	48	36	38				
BLK	32	35	39	35	21	22	30				
HSP	60	57		71	62						
MUL	59	54		53	46						
WHT	68	59	40	76	64	46	66				
FRL	35	36	32	47	40	30	37				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	33	20	34	47						
BLK	38	40	27	55	44	29	24				
HSP	63	50		70	62						
MUL	50			53							
WHT	72	61	50	74	54	42	73				
FRL	49	51	45	57	44	32	42				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	29	27		46	41						
BLK	44	50	41	52	43	20	38				
HSP	45	50		55	42						
MUL	44	50		50	50						
WHT	71	70	54	72	57	40	68				
FRL	48	53	40	53	41	29	24				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The lowest performance data component was the percentage of SWD who showed grade level proficiency in ELA. A factor that may have contributed to this gap is the lack of students' access of the curriculum (at their grade level).

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was the percentage of students with grade level proficiency in ELA in 5th grade. Half of the teachers in 5th grade last year were new to our school. These

teachers may not have had prior experience with the grade level standards and rigor necessary for student success.

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.

The greatest gap between Glen Springs and the state average was in Math with the lowest quartile. School - 32% and State - 51%, a difference of 19%. Our district's adopted resources do not fully address the complexity of the standard. This may have contributed to the decline in math performance. Also, there was a gap in the students' knowledge of basic facts which impacts the students ability to solve complex problems.

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

The most improvement was seen in 4th grade ELA achievement. We utilized materials to supplement our reading basal such as Florida Ready Resource for ELA that more directly addressed the standards and provided the rigor and complexity to master the standard. We also implemented Title I services for all grade levels that included small group pull-out and extended day instruction.

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

Areas of concern shown on the EWS data include attendance and the number of students who scored a level 1 on the statewide assessment.

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

1. Increase gains of the lowest quartile in both ELA and Math
2. Narrow the achievement gap in both ELA and Math
3. Increase the achievement level and the learning gains of SWD in both ELA and Math
4. Increase the achievement level and the learning gains of African American students in both ELA and Math
5. Increase the achievement level of 5th grade students in both ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest Quartile and Learning Gains
Rationale	The greatest gap between Glen Springs and the state average was in Math with the lowest quartile. School - 32% and State - 51%, a difference of 19%. There was an 11% difference in ELA between School - 42% and State - 53%. Students in the lowest quartile need additional support to make appropriate learning gains in ELA and Math.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in the lowest quartile will make a gain of 3% point in English Language Arts and a gain of 3% points in Mathematics. On the 2019 ELA FSA, 42% of the lowest quartile made learning gains. Our goal is to have 45% of the lowest quartile make gains on the 2020 ELA FSA. On the 2019 Math FSA, 32% of the lowest quartile made learning gains. Our goal is to have 35% of the lowest quartile make gains on the 2020 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nancy Logan (logannl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Small group instruction from Title 1 2. Extended Day Instruction - 2 days a week 3. SIPPS small group intervention 5. UFLI small groups 4. Differentiated workstations 5. Parent Meetings conducted by Title 1 personnel
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our teachers attended the James Patterson Literacy Challenge Academy and were trained on how to use UFLI with small groups to address reading deficiencies in decoding and fluency. We also received SIPPS materials and training for providing small group intervention for students with reading deficiencies in phonics. Students who are performing below grade level expectations in ELA or math will benefit from targeted small group instruction and extra instructional time.

Action Step	
Description	1. Implement the district adopted curriculum and supplemental resources with fidelity. 2. Teachers will review the Florida Standards and review test specifications in grade level and cross-grade level groups and use the information to guide their instruction. 3. After reviewing data and identifying students, teachers will pull small groups of students to provide supplemental instruction in targeted areas. 4. Bi-monthly data meetings with grade level teams with intentional focus on the learning profile and plan for our students in the lowest quartile who are not meeting grade level standards in the content areas of reading and math. 5. Analyze data and select students for Extended Day Instruction.
Person Responsible	Nancy Logan (logannl@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Achievement Gap for Black/African American Students in ELA and Math
Rationale	Our school data shows a wide discrepancy between the achievement levels and learning gains of our different subgroups and our general population. There is a gap of 36% and 41% respectively in ELA and math achievement. The federal index for our Black/African American students was 31% which is well below the target of 41% or above.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The federal Index for Black/African American students will be 41% or greater.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Small group instruction from Title 1 2. Extended Day Instruction - 2 days a week 3. SIPPS small group intervention 5. UFLI small groups 4. Differentiated workstations - Istation and IXL software programs 5. Parent Meetings conducted by Title 1 personnel 6. Culturally Responsive Training (provided by our district)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have selected these strategies based on resources available to us. Our teachers attended the James Patterson Literacy Challenge Academy this summer and were trained on using UFLI to support students with decoding and fluency deficiencies. Another resource to help students in phonics is the SIPPS program. The district has provided this resource as well as training for teachers. These resources are used with small groups and research shows small group instruction, based on data identifying individual student needs, positively impacts academic achievement and growth.

Action Step	
Description	1. Assess all students using CORE Phonics Survey and Comprehensive ELA and Math Assessments 2. Targeted interventions based on data 3. Ongoing monitoring of AIMs and ISIP 4. Flexible grouping for UFLI and SIPPS 5. Extended Day Instruction
Person Responsible	Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)

#3	
Title	Learning Gains of Students with Disabilities
Rationale	This area of focus was identified based on analysis of our. The federal index for the students with disabilities was 34% which is below the target of 41% or above. Focusing on this area will

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA achievement level will increase from 22% to 25%. Learning gains will increase from 33% to 36%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amanda Armstrong (armstraz@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. CORE Phonics Survey 2. Ongoing progress monitoring - using AIMs and ISIP 3. ESE co-teach and support facilitation model 4. SIPPS and UFLI small group instruction 5. Extended Day Instruction 6. Technology Software - Istation, IXL and Reflex Math
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have selected these strategies based on resources available to us. Our teachers attended the James Patterson Literacy Challenge Academy this summer and were trained on using UFLI to support students with decoding and fluency deficiencies. Another resource to help students in phonics is the SIPPS program. The district has provided this resource as well as training for teachers. These resources are used with small groups and research shows small group instruction based on data identifying individual student needs positively impacts academic achievement and growth. Utilizing the co-teach and support facilitation models provides the students with disabilities with in-class peer models and access to the grade level curriculum with multiple supports in place.

Action Step	
Description	1. Assess all students using CORE Phonics Survey and Comprehensive ELA and Math Assessments 2. Targeted interventions based on data 3. Ongoing monitoring 4. Flexible grouping for UFLI and SIPPS 5. ESE teachers will push into classrooms for ELA and Math support.
Person Responsible	Amanda Armstrong (armstraz@gm.sbac.edu)

#4	
Title	Disproportionate Discipline Data
Rationale	When analyzing our discipline data, we noticed a higher percentage of our out of school suspension days were received by our Black/African American students. We want to focus on this area as part of our equity plan.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce the number of out of school suspensions for Black/African American students by at least 15%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matthew Floyd (floydmw@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) 2. Start with Hello 3. Professional Development in culturally responsive best practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Positive Behavior and Intervention Support program fosters a safe and productive learning environment for all students. Social-emotional learning programs encourage students to be proactive and productive learners.
Action Step	
Description	1. Form a Positive Behavior Support Team to discuss strategies and focus. 2. PAWS store and Positive Behavior Support events 3. Provide professional development in-service for teachers and staff with district equity team
Person Responsible	Matthew Floyd (floydmw@gm.sbac.edu)

#5	
Title	Achievement of Economically Disadvantaged Students
Rationale	This is the first year that our economically disadvantaged students' federal index was below 41%. It was 37%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal is for the federal index for economically disadvantaged students to be at least 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Deanna Feagin (feagindm@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Extended Day Instruction 2. SIPPS and UFLI Interventions 3. Title 1 small group intstruction 4. Culturally Responsive Classroom
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students who are struggling to meet grade level proficiency need additional strategies and interventions in order to make achievement gains. SIPPS and UFLI are both interventions that provide support with decoding, phonics, and fluency. Extended Day Instruction and Title 1 small group both provide additional instructional time for students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Collect baseline data on students 2. Analyze the data to determine which students would benefit from additional interventions or instruction 3. On going progress monitoring 4. Professional development - Culturally Responsive Classroom, SIPPS, UFLI 5. Grade level and/or individual teacher support provided by James Patterson Literacy Challenge Liaison
Person Responsible	Deanna Feagin (feagindm@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

The school's plan for building positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders in order to fulfill the school's mission and to support the needs of students is detailed in our Title 1 Parent and Family Engagement Policy (PFEP). The PFEP has been uploaded so that it is accessible through CIMS.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Glen Springs has a full time school counselor who provides classroom counseling lessons to all students at school. Topics of classroom counseling lessons include teaching skills to help students be successful in their academic, career, and social/emotional development as aligned with the American School Counselor Association's National Model.

Students are also able to participate in small group counseling with the school counselor. Topics for small group include: social skills, test anxiety, anger management, changing families, academic success and others as need arises.

In addition, the school counselor provides individual counseling to students who present a need for this level of social, emotional,and academic support.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The district, through the Voluntary Pre-K (VPK) program, provides an opportunity for every four year old to participate in pre-kindergarten classes to become better prepared for kindergarten.

In May of each year, the school holds "Kindergarten Round-up". This is an informational session, where parents can complete necessary enrollment paperwork, ask questions, and take a tour of the kindergarten classrooms

Parents may contact the Principal or Assistant Principal for additional information and a tour of the school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school problem-solving processes include frequent and structured administrative, leadership and instructional data analysis meetings to review data and make changes in the instructional interventions groups provided by teachers.

Title 1, Part A:
Supplemental reading and math services are provided by Title 1 teachers to targeted students during the school day and in after-school tutoring programs. The FCIM coordinator assists teachers with data collection and analysis, and in the development of effective instructional strategies.

Title 1, Part C - Migrant:
A migrant liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with

Title 1 and other school and district programs to meet the needs of the students and families.

Title II:
The district receives supplemental funds for improving educational programs through the purchase of technology such as Epson projectors or document cameras. The school also utilizes the expertise of district technology coaches.

Title III:
The school works with the district ESOL representative to coordinate services to improve the education of immigrants and English-language learners. Services that are provided include educational materials such as dictionaries, home-school communication in native languages and instructional services (tutors).

Title X - Homeless:
The school works with the district Homeless Coordinator to provide needed services for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers to a free and appropriate education.

Violence Prevention Programs:
The school offers non-violence programs, such as Start with Hello to all students. In addition, the school participates in Red Ribbon Week in October with school-wide activities. The counselor also teaches the Speak Up and Be Safe program and Safer, Smarter Kids.

Nutrition Programs:
The school follows the district's nutrition program. We also participate in the Food 4 Kids backpack program that provides food each weekend and during school breaks for children who exhibit signs of hunger.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Our business partners and community volunteers provide time and resources, and participate in campus wide activities and programs.
Fifth grade students will attend an all day trip to the Cade Museum in the spring to learn how businesses operate.
The University of Florida has partnered with ACPS to provide a trip to their campus for all fifth grade students in our district. This includes watching a football game and touring their campus.
Furthermore, we work with middle school band directors who bring their bands to our campus so our fifth grade students are able to see one of the many programs available to them as they prepare for 6th grade.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest Quartile and Learning Gains				$13,592.55
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A	6.0	$8,000.00
			Notes: Teacher stipends for Extended Day Intervention			

		520-Textbooks	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$3,761.55
			Notes: Purchase of Ready Florida student workbooks and site licenses for teachers			
	5900	210-Retirement	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$678.00
			Notes: Retirement benefits for Teacher stipends for Extended Day Intervention			
	5900	220-Social Security	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$612.00
			Notes: SSI for Teacher stipends for Extended Day Intervention			
	5900	290-Other Employee Benefits	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$41.00
			Notes: Early Retirement benefits forTeacher stipends for Extended Day Intervention			
	5900	510-Supplies	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$500.00
			Notes: Supplies for Extended Day Intervention			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Achievement Gap for Black/African American Students in ELA and Math				$5,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	691-Computer Software Capitalized	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: Istation and IXL programs provided by district			
	5100	691-Computer Software Capitalized	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,500.00
			Notes: Software licenses for student insruction			
	5100	510-Supplies	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
			Notes: Materials and suppliest for student instruction.			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains of Students with Disabilities				$3,295.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	690-Computer Software	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,295.00
			Notes: License for one year for student access to Reflex Math			

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Disproportionate Discipline Data				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	General Fund		$500.00
			Notes: The funds will be used to purchase items for the PAWS store and to fund nine weeks events.			

5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Achievement of Economically Disadvantaged Students				$199,417.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.5	$153,441.00
		Notes: Salaries for an FCIM Instructional Coach and 1.5 Intervention Teachers				
	5100	210-Retirement	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$12,996.00
		Notes: Retirement benefits for Title I staff				
	5100	220-Social Security	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$11,738.00
		Notes: SSI benefits for Title I staff				
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$20,459.00
		Notes: Group Insurance benefits for Title I staff				
	5100	290-Other Employee Benefits	0331 - Glen Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$783.00
		Notes: Early Retirement benefits for Title I staff				
					Total:	**$222,304.55**