Spring Lake Elementary

leadership

analysis

students

Florida

mission

college and career

school improvement

ambitious

family and community involvement

striving   achievement

teaching   relationships

success   areas of focus

instruction

needs assessment

strategic planning   resources

collaboration   supportive environment

vision   growth

learning

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spring Lake Elementary

1105 SARAH LEE LN, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://springlakees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Aja Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: D (40%) 2014-15: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Orange County School Board on 2/11/2020.

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

Spring Lake Elementary

1105 SARAH LEE LN, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://springlakees.ocps.net/

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 PK-5	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	No	68%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/11/2020.

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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

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
Harrelson, Patty	Principal	Rachel Mott- rachel.mott@ocps.net- Instructional Coach Vanessa Burgos- Vanessa.burgos@ocps.net- Math/Science Coach Mario Boza-Mario.boza@ocps.net- Staffing Specialist/Test Coordinator Stacy Huntzinger- stacy.huntzinger@ocps.net- CCT and MTSS Antonia Lopez-antonia.lopez@ocps.net-Guidance Counselor Pamela Joseph-Pamela.joseph@ocps.net- Media Specialist
Huntzinger, Stacy	Instructional Coach	Curriculum Compliance Teacher MTSS Coach
Mott, Rachel	Instructional Coach	ELA Coach API duties
Burgos, Vanessa	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach
Boza, Mario		Staffing Specialist
Lopez, Antonia	Other	Guidance Counselor

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	63	84	71	93	76	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	11	9	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	5	6	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	38	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	1	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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
Tuesday 8/13/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	20	13	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	20	12	13	9	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	39	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	3	5	4	12	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	20	13	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	20	12	13	9	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	39	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	3	5	4	12	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	55%	57%	57%	48%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	58%	58%	48%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	52%	53%	45%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	63%	63%	51%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	61%	62%	55%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	51%	42%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	56%	53%	54%	50%	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	63 (0)	84 (0)	71 (0)	93 (0)	76 (0)	89 (0)	476 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (9)	12 (12)	11 (20)	9 (13)	12 (13)	6 (13)	50 (80)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (1)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (1)	1 (0)	4 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (10)	8 (20)	5 (12)	6 (13)	16 (9)	17 (27)	52 (91)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (23)	38 (39)	21 (49)	59 (111)
	0 (0)	0 (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.

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	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%	
	2018	58%	55%	3%	57%	1%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%	
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%	
Same Grade Comparison		14%					
Cohort Comparison		7%					
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%	
	2018	34%	55%	-21%	55%	-21%	
Same Grade Comparison		15%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%	
	2018	72%	61%	11%	62%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		-10%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	70%	63%	7%	64%	6%	
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%	
Same Grade Comparison		13%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					
05	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%	
	2018	40%	59%	-19%	61%	-21%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%	
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	55%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		6%					
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	19	52	54	19	43	40	8				

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
ELL	37	63	78	54	63	54	45				
BLK	58			42							
HSP	46	67	76	58	63	51	43				
WHT	69	65	50	70	57		66				
FRL	51	64	66	63	60	42	48				

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	9	25	31	17	25	25					
ELL	30	44	48	46	58	63	14				
BLK	60			50							
HSP	41	46	42	53	55	56	44				
WHT	65	58	45	73	59	31	67				
FRL	50	51	46	62	58	49	48				

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	5	43	55	18	36						
ELL	28	37	36	39	49	41	20				
HSP	40	44	38	45	53	39	45				
WHT	61	54	60	61	54	42	66				
FRL	48	48	45	51	55	42	54				

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35

Students With Disabilities	
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	63
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Our lowest component and only area of decline was Math learning gains for our lowest 25%. 13/45 of the students in this subgroup are ESE, and as such have established learning disabilities. We also saw lower gains in the lowest 25% for math than we did for ELA, and part of this can be contributed to the lack of intervention/FBS block for math, making less time for targeted, differentiated instruction.

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

Again, this was the greatest and only area of decline- our lowest 25% in math. (See above)

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.

Our largest gap again was our lowest 25% in Math, with our students scoring 3% below the state average. The factors addressed above also apply here, including a lack of math intervention time in the master schedule.

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

Our biggest area of increase was in the learning gains of our lowest 25% in ELA. We had a 27% increase in this component. New actions included:
• Scaffolded content standards through text dependent questions
• Used annotations to support student understanding, and to help them answer text-dependent questions
• Implemented 7-step vocabulary framework to front load vocabulary (Exc-ELL)
• Implemented buddy reading as close read 1 to build fluency and promote accountability (Exc-ELL, DPLC)
• Provided lowest 25% students additional push-in support during small group instruction
• Provided lowest 25% students pull out intervention using LLI, a research-based curriculum
• Provided lowest 25% English Language Learners with Elements of Vocabulary small group

instruction
• Provided small group tutoring opportunities where students were ability grouped 2 days a week after school for 1 hour targeting deficient skills (Last year we reinforced the core)
• Provided Saturday School opportunities weekly for 4 hours to support grade level content (Last year we had 3 hours)

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

67 of our returning students have below 90% attendance. 6 of them have been in truancy court for the past year, but continue to be truant. We plan to target them with an additional layer of support and interventions this year.

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

1. Increase ESE/Lowest 25% Math learning gains
2. Increase Science high achieving
3. Continue to increase ELA high achieving and Learning Gains
4. Continue to increase Math High Achieving
5. Increase Cultural Responsivity in our school and community

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase the learning gains of our ESE students and Lowest 25% in ELA and Math
Rationale	Our lowest 25% in math is the only area of decrease for us this past year. We had a slight decline, and only have 48% of our lowest students making gains in math. 13 of our lowest 25% in Math, and 12 of our lowest 25% in ELA are ESE students. We have 18 ESE total, and that is our one subgroup that did not meet expectations.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Currently, 48% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in math. Our goal is for at least 55% of our lowest 25% to make learning gains this year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Patty Harrelson (patty.harrelson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The students in the lowest 25% have been identified and will be strategically monitored by our leadership team, with their own data matrix/chart.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have compiled a "watch list" of our lowest 25%, identifying them for extra layers of intervention and support. This also allows us to monitor their progress closely and frequently, making adjustments as necessary.
Action Step	
Description	1. Students in lowest 25% identified and watch list established. 2. Data meetings will be conducted biweekly for these students, in order to monitor progress. 3. Necessary adjustments will be discussed and tweaked 4. All students in the lowest 25% will be assigned a staff member as a mentor. Mentors will provide an extra layer of support for these students, meeting with them weekly and being available for them as needed. 5. Students will be placed in intervention groups, as well as after-school tutoring that is differentiated to meet their needs. 6. Parent Night events will be held specifically for the parents of our lowest 25%, with the focus being on tools to help these parents support their children academically, socially, and with attendance issues.
Person Responsible	Mario Boza (mario.boza@ocps.net)

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).

We will continue to provide targeted and fluid tutoring groups after school for grades 2-5. These groups will be based on data indicating areas of deficiencies. When students demonstrate mastery, they will move out, and other students will move in. We will also continue to provide Saturday school once a month.

In order to continue the tremendous growth that we had in cultural responsivity, we will again host our

Hispanic Pride month, with research and cultural activities happening throughout, culminating in our Hispanic Pride school-wide event. We will also have a Culture and Climate Committee that will ensure that our curriculum reflects our diversity, as well as our school-wide events. We will provide an extra support to our ELL parents, including Rosetta Stone for english acquisition, and monthly parent events translated into Spanish. All communication that goes home verbally or written will be provided in English and Spanish. We have also added an instructional support facilitator for our ELL first year students, who are new to the country.

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, Â§ 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.

We plan to continue our home visits initiative started last year, with teachers reaching out to families for visits. We also have monthly parent and family engagement opportunities scheduled, with the topics aligned to specific needs of our community.

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.

We have a full-time Guidance Counselor. One on one and group counseling is provided for fragile students. Our entire staff will be completing professional development modules on the mental health of youth.

District Health curriculum includes weekly social-emotional and mental health lessons for all student, K-5.

Our school also has an established Threat Assessment Team that meets monthly to discuss any students that have been in crisis that month. Threat assessment protocol is in place to protect our at-risk students.

We also have a strong mentor program, with staff signing up to volunteer as mentors. Mentors meet weekly with their mentees, with monthly craft times planned. They establish communication with the classroom teacher, and are available

Our Guidance Counselor provides 2 Safety Matters lessons to all classrooms throughout the year.

We have a grant-funded counselor that serves our students once a week. She provides six sessions for any student that is referred.

Our District PLC initiative has added a social-emotional learning component this year, which all of our staff will be trained on. This will bring greater awareness to the importance of SEL, as well as resources and tools to equip our staff.

Social-emotional learning has been added to our lesson plans through the District PLC initiative, providing students with opportunities to practice strategies.

We have a permanent SRO this year, and she actively participates in the counseling of students when requested. She is a resource and safe place in which our students can confide.

We are starting a parent support group for those parents that have an at-risk student. This group will be led by our Guidance Counselor with bilingual translation available.

For our students that are new to the country, our sponsor The Love Pantry provides food and some clothing resources for our students. Hygiene supplies and other resources help our families acclimate to the different cultures and customs.

Our staff is engaging in a book study called Poor Kids- Richer Teaching. This book has strategies for our staff to use with students to increase their empathy, and to teach students how to have grit and coping strategies.

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

Kindergarten students and new Spring Lake students are given tours to acclimate them to their new learning environment. Our CRT gives new students a tour and speaks to them about the expectations of our school.

Fifth Graders have the opportunity to be Patrol Leaders and they help students who need assistance in the cafe for breakfast, arrival and dismissal assistance, and hallway duties.

Students are assigned a class mentor when they are new to the school. Students who do not speak English are given a bilingual class mentor.

Our fifth grade students attend orientation at Ocoee Middle School, and tour the facility. This orientation provides them with important procedures and protocols at OMS.

Our fourth and fifth grade classes are departmentalized in order to help students with that transition to middle school.

All students at Spring Lake are sorted into one of four houses. This gives them an immediate sense of belonging and a family in addition to their homeroom.

We have a new family social each nine weeks, so that new families can meet other families and interact.

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 Leadership Team will meet on a weekly basis to discuss the academic and behavioral progress of students. The Leadership Team will provide support for teachers in order for students to achieve and for teachers to be successful and confident.

Principal will conduct monthly data meetings with each team, where data points and progress monitoring will be discussed. Technology resources providing data (I-Ready, AR, STAR, and Imagine Learning) will also guide instructional support to students.

The Leadership Team and classroom teachers will identify students who are at risk for not meeting grade level expectations. After identifying at-risk students in data meetings teachers will meet individually with the MTSS team to define the problem, analyze the data, develop a student action plan, implement the intervention, and monitor student progress. The team will reconvene in 4-6 weeks to evaluate the effectiveness of the Student Action Plan.

Content Coaches meet 2x per week with teachers in common planning. CRMs are tweaked and implementation, assessing, monitoring, and reteaching is discussed.

Title I - Funds are used to hire instructional support teachers. Additionally, funds are used for supplemental intervention materials, parent involvement activities, intensive tutoring and professional development.

SAI funds - These will be utilized for supplemental reading resources and to provide intensive Tier 3 support.

Classroom visits and specific feedback/coaching provided to all instructional staff.

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

Spring Lake has College Days where students wear college shirts and if the opportunity is available, we have students from high schools to discuss their opportunity of going to a college. Teach In informs students of the opportunities to have a career and the education needed to obtain the career position. Each teacher has their name and logo of the college the teacher attended to obtain their different degrees. We have purchased pennants from each college that our faculty graduated from, as well as all Florida schools. These are displayed prominently in our hallways. We have also coordinated with our feeder middle and high school to do a senior "walkout" this year. Seniors from our local high school with walk through our halls in cap and gown, with our students cheering them on. This will help students see that they graduation is the desired end result for them.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase the learning gains of our ESE students and Lowest 25% in ELA and Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00