Rock Springs Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rock Springs Elementary

2400 ROCK SPRINGS RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://rockspringses.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Teresa King

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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	
* 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 Orange 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.

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

Rock Springs Elementary

2400 ROCK SPRINGS RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://rockspringses.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	91%

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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Darr, Kari	Principal	The Principal serves as an instructional leader at Rock Springs Elementary. She assists and observes teachers with data-based decisions making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. She meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier II and Tier III. The Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Carcara, John	Assistant Principal	The Assistant principal serves with the Principal as an instructional leader at Rock Springs Elementary. He assists and observes teachers with data-based decisions making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. The Assistant Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Johnson, Alicia	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components, supports teachers with data-driven instruction, and coaches identified teachers daily. She also facilitates data collection for grades K-5. In addition, she conducts professional developments with the faculty to ensure that best practices in all areas of instruction are utilized.
Heers, Lori	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist provides guidance on identified students with behavior needs, supports teachers with running behaviors plans and facilitates behavior data collection for grades PreK-5.
Shaver, Andrea	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist provides guidance on identified students with behavior needs, supports teachers with running behaviors plans and facilitates behavior data collection for grades PreK-5.
Frick, Jacqueline	Staffing Specialist	The staffing specialist ensures that Rock Springs is compliant in meeting the needs as identified by quality IEPs and EPs by providing professional development for ESE and Gifted teachers in writing IEPs and EPs that are compliant with the current district rules and procedures. She also participates in the decision making for intervention/enrichment by collaborating with the MTSS coaches and classroom teacher to ensure there is a plan in place to support student success.
Leonard, Amanda	Instructional Coach	The MTSS coach collaborates with the other instructional coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by providing guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components. They also facilitate whole school screening programs that provide interventions services for those considered to be "at-risk" while implementing progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis plan. In response, as the needs of the student and teacher are identified, professional development is designed, presented, and support is provided.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCarthy, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	The MTSS coach collaborates with the other instructional coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by providing guidance on the K-12reading and math plan components. They also facilitate whole school screening programs that provide interventions services for those considered to be "at-risk" while implementing progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis plan. In response, as the needs of the student and teacher are identified, professional development is designed, presented, and support is provided.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/20/2020, Teresa King

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.*
1

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
47

Total number of students enrolled at the school
690

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	31	120	109	134	113	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	19	37	30	38	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	11	18	24	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	1	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/13/2021

2020-21 - 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	25	106	124	113	129	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	9	29	34	27	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	0	0	15	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	25	106	124	113	129	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	9	29	34	27	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	0	0	15	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				64%	57%	57%	59%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	58%	58%	47%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	52%	53%	33%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	63%	63%	62%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	61%	62%	56%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	48%	51%	35%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				61%	56%	53%	50%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	63%	-1%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady Diagnostic

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	31	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	22	35
	Students With Disabilities	19	19	27
	English Language Learners	13	13	24
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	30	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	22	25
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	21
	English Language Learners	20	13	24

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	26	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	22	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	15
	English Language Learners	4	9	4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	9	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	6	22
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	10
	English Language Learners	0	4	10

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	29	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	24	30
	Students With Disabilities	7	6	6
	English Language Learners	12	17	26
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4	11	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	6	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	7
	English Language Learners	0	6	16

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	27	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	22	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	4	10	17
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	14	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	8	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	17

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	19	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	13	21
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	6
	English Language Learners	4	13	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	15	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	11	19
	Students With Disabilities	13	7	19
	English Language Learners	0	0	8
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64	63	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	47	43
	Students With Disabilities	36	17	27
	English Language Learners	48	39	38

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	22	32	17	20	42	27	18				
ELL	45	40	30	43	42	20	45				
ASN	100			73							
BLK	53	55		49	55		50				
HSP	51	46	33	47	53	41	56				
WHT	56	51		54	62		62				
FRL	52	45	25	42	41	11	43				
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	25	47	48	43	76	68	25				
ELL	39	66	79	47	67	57	39				
ASN	64			82							

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
BLK	62	68	45	56	59	36	57				
HSP	61	69	70	59	67	61	55				
MUL	56	50		56	58						
WHT	68	64	38	76	74	71	69				
FRL	56	63	62	58	66	62	49				

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	22	29	21	23	45	50	27				
ELL	31	33	21	36	51	33	15				
BLK	52	46		51	60		38				
HSP	49	43	25	56	53	38	43				
MUL	44	45		67	64						
WHT	73	50	42	70	55	29	60				
FRL	50	39	28	55	49	29	46				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	46
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	57
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 Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

According to the Reading iReady Diagnostic, students in grades 2-5 increased proficiency in the following subgroup areas: Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners. However, Students with Disabilities either stayed the same or decreased on Reading iReady Diagnostic. According to the Math iReady diagnostic, students in grades 2-5 in all subgroups; Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners increased proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

According to the 2019 FSA ELA 64% of students performed proficient. According to the 2021 end-of-year i-Ready Diagnostic, 33% of students in grades 3-5 performed proficient. Also, according to the 2019 FSA Math 65% of students performed proficient. According to the 2021 end-of-year Diagnostic, 29% of students in grades 3-5 performed proficient, ELA and Math proficient are identified as Rock Springs's greatest need for improvement for the 2021-2022 school year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors for for the 2020-2021 school year according to i-Ready is that students were able to take the diagnostic in a non-testing environment (via LaunchED @ Home). Also, students have not received a consistent model of instruction for the 2020-2021 school year. To improve these gaps, Rock Springs will provide consistent standard-based instruction and make next step plans based on students performing below grade level on the i-Ready Diagnostic.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Rock Springs progress monitoring data declined in ELA, Math and Science. However, 61% of students scored proficient on FCAT Statewide Science Assessment. According to the progress monitoring PMA 3 Assessment, 58% of students performed proficient. This is the lowest gap shown between the 2019 State Assessment and 2021 progress monitoring data.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

For the 2020-2021 school year, students were instructed in various ways: LaunchED @ Home, Face to Face, and Blended. Also, Face to Face students were asked to socially distance from each other. While students were not able to perform group experiments together, the teacher often did a

demonstration experiment and allowed students to process their thinking with one another from a distance or virtually. Thus, experiments were still performed, just in a different way.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

To accelerate learning, standard-based lessons will need to meet the level of rigor expected for the standard. Also, Rock Springs will need to identify struggling students early and provide interventions based on their Early Warning Indicators.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development on standard-based lessons will occur weekly based on upcoming lessons and student's standard-based assessment data. Also, teachers will be trained on intervention programs that will be taught to support student learning. Coaching and modeling of the programs will also be provided to teachers when needed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Rock Springs will provide tutoring to identified students based on grade level data. Small group instruction will also be provided to ensure all students are understanding the content.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in Reading and Math was identified as a critical need based on students not receiving consistent methods of instruction during the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	By increasing the rigor of consistent standards-based instruction through implementing processing strategies, we anticipate seeing proficiency increase from 64% to 65% in English Language Arts, from 65% to 66% in Mathematics and from 61% to 62% in Science.
Monitoring:	Data meetings will be held once a month with grade-level teachers to discuss student progress and determine next steps. The leadership team will also meet monthly to discuss and identify students and next steps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies that we will implement include increasing the rigor of the standards-based instruction through processing strategies, team planning and using assessments to drive instruction. Formative assessments data will be utilized to monitor the effectiveness of the selected strategies, In addition, coaches and administration will be present during team planning meetings to monitor the development of rigorous standards-based lessons that include processing strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction is key to increasing student achievement. Through structured team planning, we will be able to collaboratively determine what students need to know in order to achieve the standard. Through planning, teachers' capacity will increase through collaboration and the support of instructional leaders. To determine if our standard-based instruction is working, we will utilize formative assessments data. Outcomes from the formative assessment data will drive our small group instruction focus.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide Professional Development based on walk trends and teacher interest.

Person Responsible	Alicia Johnson (alicia.johnson@ocps.net)

Use Standard-Based Assessments identify students' needs.

Person Responsible	Alicia Johnson (alicia.johnson@ocps.net)

Provide tutoring to identify students.

Person Responsible	Amanda Leonard (amanda.leonard@ocps.net)

Weekly math fact/sight word companions will be held during lunch.

Person Responsible	Alicia Johnson (alicia.johnson@ocps.net)

Hold weekly common planning times to collaborate on the upcoming standard-based lessons.

Person Responsible	Alicia Johnson (alicia.johnson@ocps.net)

Provide Professional Development with deliverable Culturally Responsive Standards-Based Teaching strategies.

Person Responsible Andrea Shaver (andrea.shaver@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By placing a priority on the MTSS process and establishing an understanding of expectations for implementation, the identification of students' needs will occur and can be addressed. In targeting the specific needs of our students, overall students achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2020-2021 school year, 9% of students in K-2 are performing on grade level according to ELA iReady End of year (EOY) Diagnostic. Also, students scoring proficient in FSA ELA is 65% is the 2018-2019 school year. By strengthening and monitoring the effectiveness of ELA MTSS process, our percentage of students reading on grade level will increase to 50% performing on grade level in K-2 according to iReady Diagnostic and 65% proficient on FSA ELA.
Monitoring:	MTSS academic meetings will be held monthly and led by the MTSS coaches. Identifed students academic data will be discussed and next steps will be planned for those students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Leonard (amanda.leonard@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be providing intensive instruction (Standards and Tier reading Instruction) with purposeful progress monitoring. This will be monitored through iReady Diagnostic results, Standard-based grade-level assessments and Tier instructional data collection.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs in a smaller setting using researched-based programs; such as, Reading Mastery, SIPPS or iReady toolbox. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Hold monthly MTSS meetings to discuss students in the MTSS process.

Person Responsible	Jennifer McCarthy (jennifer.mccarthy@ocps.net)

Monitor and provide feedback on Tier II and Tier III instruction.

Person Responsible	Amanda Leonard (amanda.leonard@ocps.net)

Provide training on Tier II and Tier III intervetion resources to staff members.

Person Responsible	Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)

Meet with the identified lowest 25% quarterly to discuss progress and needs.

Person Responsible	Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Social-Emotional Learning instruction is critical to increasing our students' ability to succeed both academically and socially. Students that receive SEL instruction are shown to have increased academic achievement and reduced emotional stress.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2020-2021 school year, students received a total of 175 discipline referrals. This year our goal is to reduce that number by 20%.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will meet monthly to discuss students that fall in the Early Warning Indicators. After identifying these students the guidance counselor and behavior specialist will support them via small counseling groups or MTTS Behavior.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Shaver (andrea.shaver@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Rock Springs will develop and implement a school-wide team focused on creating procedures to follow in common school areas. We will also participate in the district-wide initiative of implementing SEL classroom strategies. Teachers will also use the program 2nd Steps with fidelity to support their Health lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students participate in researched-based SEL programs that focus on increasing students' social and emotional growth, students' academics increase, behaviors improve and emotional stress is lowered.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide Professional Development on SEL.

Person Responsible	Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)

Hold monthly MTSS Behavior meetings.

Person Responsible	Lori Heers (lori.heers@ocps.net)

Provide small group counseling to identified students.

Person Responsible	John Carcara (john.carcara@ocps.net)

Monitor 2nd Steps is taught with fidelity via classroom visits.

Person Responsible	Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to Safe School for Alex website, Rock Springs is ranked very high when compared to other elementary schools statewide. When looking at discipline trends, there was a large number of referrals from our ASD unit. We have revised students behavior plans to address these concerns. We have also increaed the amount of Social Emotional Learning groups to support students with handling their feelings on a productive manner. School culture and environment will be monitored with staff, student and parent surveys.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff. A core team has completed a district training on Culturally Responsive Standards-Based Teaching strategies, through professional development opportunities, teachers and staff will be presented with deliverable CRSBT strategies to build and improve on student academic growth.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Rock Springs strives to create a school culture that is positive, supportive and inclusive of all students and stakeholders. Rock Springs collaborates with all stakeholders, including faculty and staff, parents, PTA, School Advisory Committee (SAC), and community members.
A core team of teachers and administrators, including the guidance counselor will attend district-wide professional development throughout the year. The core team will then provide professional development to the staff and administration will monitor the implementation of SEL strategies used within the classrooms.
The PTA's goal is increase family engagement through events and promote inclusion of all stakeholders.
The SAC works to promote school community and informs stakeholders on school-wide data trends, school budget and community concerns. The SAC and Rock Springs work together to provide solutions to community concerns.

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**				**$0.00**
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction**				**$140,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2110	100-Salaries	1011 - Rock Springs Elementary	General Fund		$140,000.00
			Notes: MTSS Coaches help support teachers and monitors student progress.			
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$71,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2110	100-Salaries	1011 - Rock Springs Elementary	General Fund		$71,000.00
			Notes: Guidance Counselor			
					Total:	**$211,000.00**