

Lake County Schools

Spring Creek Charter School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Spring Creek Charter School

44440 SPRING CREEK RD, Paisley, FL 32767

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

Demographics

Principal: Wesley Locke

Start Date for this Principal: 5/25/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Spring Creek Charter School

44440 SPRING CREEK RD, Paisley, FL 32767

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	15%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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 Spring Creek Charter School is to provide a solid academic foundation through a collaborative environment which instills cooperation, assertiveness, responsibility, empathy, and self-control. We strive to inspire, within our school family, a love of learning that empowers our students to achieve their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We Believe:

- Every child has the potential to learn.
- Each person is valuable.
- We can make a difference.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Locke, Wesley	Principal	Facilitate, maintain and monitor all aspects of fiscal and academic business as it pertains to Spring Creek Charter School
O'Neal, Kim	Assistant Principal	Support and assist the principal to facilitate, maintain and monitor all aspects of fiscal and academic business as it pertains to Spring Creek Charter School
Christner, Virginia	Other	ESE School Specialist: facilitate, maintain and oversee all aspects of the Exceptional Student Education program
Watson, Melinda	School Counselor	Facilitate, maintain and oversee the social, emotional, mental health and well being of students in Grades VPK-3 and all staff
	School Counselor	Jade Schnovel: Facilitate, maintain and oversee the social, emotional, mental health and well being of students in Grades 4-8 and all staff
Wiehe, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	MTSS and Testing oversight, facilitation and monitoring
Ferrie, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Facilitate, maintain, oversee and support staff professional development and student achievement with an emphasis on coaching ELA in all academic and content areas

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 5/25/2015, Wesley Locke

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

3

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 .	

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	66	65	71	55	69	77	45	38	42	0	0	0	0	528
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	3	3	2	5	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	30

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	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/11/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	80	59	74	76	87	42	41	40	0	0	0	0	571
Attendance below 90 percent	10	10	8	9	8	10	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	3	5	3	5	9	1	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	1	14	7	9	1	13	8	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	17	16	9	8	14	0	0	0	0	69

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	6	4	6	8	8	4	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	42

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	11	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	80	59	74	76	87	42	41	40	0	0	0	0	571
Attendance below 90 percent	10	10	8	9	8	10	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	3	5	3	5	9	1	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	1	14	7	9	1	13	8	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	17	16	9	8	14	0	0	0	0	69

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	6	4	6	8	8	4	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	42

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	11	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	50%	68%	61%	49%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	63%	59%	58%	65%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	56%	54%	43%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	49%	70%	62%	48%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%	65%	59%	70%	67%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	54%	52%	66%	65%	50%
Science Achievement	47%	59%	56%	49%	64%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	83%	78%	74%	82%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	60%	-22%	58%	-20%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	56%	59%	-3%	56%	0%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
	2018	45%	47%	-2%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	51%	49%	2%	52%	-1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	27%	48%	-21%	51%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
	2018	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	40%	62%	-22%	62%	-22%
	2018	61%	65%	-4%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	61%	-10%	64%	-13%
	2018	53%	60%	-7%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	41%	57%	-16%	60%	-19%
	2018	43%	58%	-15%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
06	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
07	2019	60%	58%	2%	54%	6%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	54%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	0%	39%	-39%	46%	-46%
	2018	43%	39%	4%	45%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-43%				
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	56%	-5%	53%	-2%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	35%	49%	-14%	48%	-13%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	50%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison				-19%		
Cohort Comparison				-12%		

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	71%	0%	71%	0%
2018	61%	70%	-9%	71%	-10%
Compare				10%	

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	52%	33%	61%	24%
2018	90%	62%	28%	62%	28%
Compare				-5%	

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	27	52	46	25	38	31	24				
ELL	25	53		25	29						
HSP	34	56	50	30	35	15	25				
WHT	53	53	44	52	51	39	51	76	83		

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
FRL	46	53	48	47	48	36	42	80	92		
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	15	27	32	26	40	31	18				
ELL	21	40		36	60						
HSP	41	38	46	39	58	71	32				
WHT	48	49	41	59	56	50	55	62	83		
FRL	43	44	38	54	55	52	46	54	92		
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	13	35	33	21	50	56	15				
ELL	11	38		11	62						
HSP	45	56	44	40	56	55	43				
WHT	49	59	43	50	73	68	50	73	80		
FRL	45	58	42	44	69	68	44	67	80		

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	54
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	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Due to the COVID-19 shut down we did not receive any state test scores. We focused our data analysis on the previous year's scores, the 2019-20 STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and STAR Math scores, and the initial 2020-21 STAR scores. We know that math is still a very strong need as this was our lowest performing subject in 2018-19 on the FSA. But, we have also noted a tremendous decrease in student's reading comprehension scores as compared to tests taken before the COVID shutdown. Nearly every student from grades 1st thru 8th has shown a decrease in Reading scores over this shutdown period. We have chosen to treat each student as though they are in need of intervention in both Reading and Math.

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

Reading skills have taken a big decline since the March 2020 closure of schools due to COVID-19. We have many students who have dropped more than one grade level in reading proficiency scores on the STAR Reading assessment. Our students have been out of school for nearly 6 months. And, in a rural community with a very high poverty rate, many of these students were not exposed to reading on a regular basis over this shutdown period. We did provide a distance learning model from March till June of 2020. However, many of our students did not sufficiently participate due to various factors, such as; poor internet connectivity issues, lack of parental supervision, and other contributing factors.

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.

8th Grade Math was the component with the greatest gap compared to the state average. The low number of students who took the test, and the fact that nearly all these students have learning disabilities was the biggest factor. We do realize that we must intervene more intensively with our lowest quartile of math students. This problem has only been amplified by the COVID-19 shutdown.

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

7th Grade ELA improved from 27% 3 and above in 2017 to 51% 3 and above in 2018, just 1% below the state average. Our 7th grade ELA teacher was in his 2nd year as the teacher with this curriculum. He also introduced some significant intervention pieces for students who were behind in certain standards. We feel these interventions will be needed to continue in order to keep these ELA scores at this level. The decreased amount of structured reading instruction over the end of the 2019-20 school year has definitely had a significant impact in our student's reading skill level.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Spring Creek Charter School has a continual problem with high absenteeism. This continues to be a major area of concern for us. Last school year we saw some significant improvement in school attendance with a big push from administration in focusing on this problem, making many phone calls, and providing quarterly rewards for perfect attendance. This year, however, we must encourage families to keep students at home if they are showing possible symptoms of illness, and we expect to see an increase in absenteeism this school year.

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

1. Small Group Instruction and fidelity of teaching in this model
2. Reading deficiencies due to COVID-19 shutdown
3. Math foundational skills
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SCCS will focus on the creation, implementation and improvement of standards based report cards for grades K-5.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase state testing scores to be equal to or higher than state averages. Reduce number of student retention and number of students receiving intervention
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wesley Locke (lockew@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intentional structured instruction, progress monitoring and assessment based on BEST standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation, monitoring and support of standards based learning should increase student achievement

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) creation of standards based report cards and alignment of common assessments
Person Responsible Wesley Locke (lockew@lake.k12.fl.us)
- 2) adoption of new VPK curriculum (FrogStreet PK-5) to align with foundational and K standards
Person Responsible Kim O'Neal (onealm@lake.k12.fl.us)
- 3) individual targeted student tracking through data wall and analysis of standards
- 4) Through the use of Title I funds we will employ a Literacy Coach to support teachers in the classroom.
- 5) Through the use of Title I funds we will provide professional development for teachers in The Responsive Classroom. This training will help teachers apply Social/Emotional and Academic standards in the classroom.
Person Responsible Wesley Locke (lockew@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2018-2019 FSA analysis identified 45% of students were within 5 scale score points of achieving the next level. Due to the circumstances of the 2019-2020 school year, SCCS will continue to implement and monitor small group instruction as an intervention as well as acceleration strategy. Student achievement should increase with meeting students where they are academically while providing structured support.

Measurable Outcome: Decrease number of students within five scale score points of achieving the next level to below 45%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Wesley Locke (lockew@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: structured skill based small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explicit instruction in targeted area of student need should increase student achievement

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) Skill Based Intervention/Acceleration Small Groups; no less than three times a week; review of student data no less than quarterly
- 2) Through the use of Title I funds we will employ 4 teacher assistants to work directly with students in small groups to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.
- 3) Through the use of Title I funds we will employ 2 additional classroom teachers to reduce class size below district allocations to improve the learning environment.
- 4) Through the use of Title I funds we will purchase educational software for Math and ELA (Moby Max and STAR) for student practice and tracking student progress.

Person Responsible Wesley Locke (lockew@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Data available from the 2018-2019 SY identified a large gap in student achievement. School leadership has initiated conversations with grade levels. Discussion and decisions to be made revolve around curriculum choice, integrity of curriculum, supplemental materials, foundational skill remediation and ongoing review of student progress monitoring.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Spring Creek Charter School (SCCS) utilizes the Responsive Classroom (RC) approach to explicitly teach, model, implement and follow through with social emotional learning for all students, staff and stakeholders. Professional development funding is deliberately set aside for all staff to be trained in RC. Through ongoing training, all stakeholders benefit from a school culture built on caring, assertion, responsibility, empathy and self control.

In addition, .SCCS has on staff two school counselors who are dedicated to the well being and mental health of students, staff and community. The School Guidance Plan utilizes whole group, small group and individual counseling as well as community workshops . The plan also includes working concurrently with outside agencies for mental health as necessary.

The Charter Board is the acting SAC. The Board is consulted regularly for input and feedback regarding creation and implementation of governing plans. The Spring Creek PTO is the parent based group who is also consulted for input. All stakeholders have access to bring forth any issues or concerns to these groups. Through the use of Title I funds Spring Creek will purchase Blue Tree Mobile App and OneCall Now call out system to communicate with families and community regarding school events as well as important messages. The Blue Tree App will allow notifications to go directly to parent cell phones. These systems will support a home-school connection to improve academic achievement.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$2,695.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0631 - Spring Creek Charter School	Title II		\$2,695.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Development. provided to assist Intensive Reading instructors in the use of Achieve 3000, a reading intervention program for below level readers.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$15,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0631 - Spring Creek Charter School	Title II		\$15,400.00

	<i>Notes: Professional Development, provided over multiple days, on small group instruction using the Center for the Collaborative Classroom curriculum (SIPPS, Being a Reader, and Being a Writer)</i>	
		Total: \$18,095.00