

Orange County Public Schools

Spring Lake Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spring Lake Elementary

1105 SARAH LEE LN, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://springlakees.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Aja Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2016

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	Yes
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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: 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	
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spring Lake Elementary

1105 SARAH LEE LN, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://springlakees.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	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	78%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 that all students have 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
Harrelson, Patty	Principal	Oversees all instructional programs, and classroom instruction. Coaches teachers and reading PLCs. Skyward Lead, master scheduling, SELL Team lead (social emotional learning initiative). SAC committee, School Improvement Plan, Professional Development presenter.
Cozzi, Ashley	Staffing Specialist	Oversees all of our ESE programs, ensures IEP/504 compliance, holds all IEP/504 meetings, and provides supports to our ESE students and their families.
Henleben, Amanda	Math Coach	Lead Math and Science PLCs for our faculty, ensure that all Math/science plans are on standard and rigorous. Instructional Coach, and head of the Math Committee. Ms Henleben also monitors classroom instruction, and gives feedback to our instructional staff. In addition, she is our After school tutoring coordinator.
Huntzinger, Stacy	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Huntzinger oversees our ELL students, and their instructional needs. She ensures that all testing and paperwork for our ELLs is complete and in compliance. In addition, Ms. Huntzinger leads our MTSS program, holding meetings and providing guidance to those teachers with students in Tiers 2 and 3. She also oversees our bilingual paras, and makes their schedule. Title One paperwork is an additional duty that falls to Ms. Huntzinger.
	Dean	Oversees students discipline, to include school-wide behavior expectations, PASS, detention, and restorative justice practices. Mrs. Guion also oversees our Cafeteria procedures, maintaining order and seating charts for all students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/18/2016, Aja Wilkins

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

451

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

5

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

5

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	24	64	60	98	56	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	11	22	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/18/2021

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	50	69	83	77	83	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	14	30	28	27	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	2	3	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	50	69	83	77	83	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	14	30	28	27	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	2	3	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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				55%	57%	57%	51%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	58%	58%	52%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				70%	52%	53%	43%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	63%	63%	61%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	61%	62%	57%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	48%	51%	51%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	56%	53%	51%	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	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	63%	7%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Beginning of the Year, Middle of the Year, and End of the Year diagnostic Assessment- ELA and Math

Progress Monitoring Activity Assessments- Science

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	69	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	69	83
	Students With Disabilities	0	100	0
	English Language Learners	29	65	75
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	38	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	38	68
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	33	35	57
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	22	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	22	44
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	12	11	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	30	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	30	68
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	40
	English Language Learners	19	14	24

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/20%	25/23%	46/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/20%	25/23%	46/30%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	50%	50%
	English Language Learners	10%	15%	27%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/9%	17/21%	37/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/9%	17/21%	37/42%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	50%
	English Language Learners	3%	12%	22%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21/25%	27/41%	42/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/25%	27/41%	42/47%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	25%
	English Language Learners	16%	22%	38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/8%	15/17%	31/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/8%	15/17%	31/35%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	25%
	English Language Learners	5%	15%	29%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/17%	18/20%	38/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/17%	18/20%	38/40%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	8%	8%
	English Language Learners	14%	24%	38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/8%	25/27%	48/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/8%	25/27%	48/50%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	8%	16%
	English Language Learners	3%	16%	44%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/54%	34/43%	37/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/54%	34/43%	37/46%
	Students With Disabilities	2/50%	0/0%	1/25%
	English Language Learners	13/41%	7/21%	9/24%

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	32	55		29	73						
ELL	44	60	73	40	42	36	34				
HSP	51	60	71	49	48	44	43				
WHT	71	50		51	29		44				
FRL	53	58	67	44	37	38	40				
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				
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				

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	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				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	49
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Our high achieving categories have been on the steady increase for 3 years, prior to the pandemic. Our learning gains were also trending up in all categories with the exception of lowest 25% in Math.

Our Students with Disabilities subgroup continues to show the lowest percentage of increase, and is our only ESSA subgroup that did not make acceptable progress. According to Progress Monitoring Data, our SWD group are 32% less proficient in ELA, and 22% less proficient in Math.

In addition, our ELL subgroup is just 7% less proficient in ELA, and 12% less proficient in Math. This means that we continue to close gaps for these students at a rapid pace.

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

Our SWD subgroup continues to be our greatest area for improvement. Our lowest 25% Math learning gains is the single grade component that wasn't an improvement for us. The majority of students in that group were our ESE students.

We want to continue our three-year rise in high achieving, learning gains, and lowest 25% learning gains for all students.

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

Our ESE and Lowest 25% students require extra layers of support that can be very challenging for a small school. We are excited to have added 4 interventionists this year who will be supporting and intervening with this subgroup primarily. Very intentional scheduling, front-loading instruction, and acceleration tutoring are now in place for this group of students at every grade level.

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

We showed improvement across the board with the exception of lowest 25% math gains.

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

Extended learning opportunities for all students below grade level were offered. Our master schedule is intentionally planned so that our resource staff can push-in to support our fragile students. PLCs were utilized to ensure that instruction is standards-based and rigorous enough for the intent of the standard. We also added a reteach focus calendar, tracking the reteach and reassessment of all students. We moved to a greater emphasis on small group targeted instruction as a part of our reteach effort.

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

All effective strategies that produced growth will be continued. Acceleration tutoring will be in place for all 3-5, and 1st and 2nd graders in second semester. Our

interventionists and ESE teachers will use front-loading strategies to further support our students with disabilities, and lowest 25%. Our ELL paras use support facilitation to support our year 2 and 3 ELLs, and direct instruction for our year one ELLs. We will also utilize Imagine Learning for our Year 1 ELLs. We are also piloting a new math computer-based instructional program K-5 (Symphony Math).

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.

PD will be provided for Writing/ELA- (Core Connections) K-5, 4 times this year.

Science PD- Impact trainings, and district science PD provided 3 times this year.

Math PD- Symphony Math trainings were provided during Pre-planning (2 sessions) and ongoing support will be provided by the district.

ELA and Math- small group showcase will be done again once per semester. We will showcase our high-performing instructional staff so that others can learn from their expertise.

ELA- Wonders training on our new curriculum

ELA- BEST standards training on new standards

ELA- SIPPS training on supplemental phonics program

ELA- Early Interventions in Reading training was provided to all interventionists and resource team during pre-planning.

SELL PD will be provided 4 times this year, supporting our teachers in strategies that help them create a class atmosphere where students have a sense of belonging, as well as grit and stamina.

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

Our Social Emotional Learning and Leadership team will be working to share and infuse strategies that will support our students during this pandemic and time of transition back to face to face learning.

DCTL- Our digital and curriculum team is supporting teachers in device set-up and continuity of instruction when our students have to be quarantined.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our latest school grade calculation reflects growth and an upward trend in all areas except for our lowest 25% math learning gains. In addition, our only ESSA subgroup not to make progress was our students with disabilities group. This group is largely the makeup of our lowest 25%

Measurable Outcome: In 2019, 48% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in math. In 2022, we expect at least 55% of our lowest 25% to make learning gains in Math.

We will monitor our i-Ready and Symphony Math diagnostics closely, to ensure that students are making growth in Math from the Beginning of Year assessment, to mid, and then at the end of the year.

Monitoring: We will also closely monitor our Unit assessment data for mastery and progress. We will follow up on the reteach and reassessment plans for this target subgroup, and monitor closely for results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amanda Henleben (amanda.henleben@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Symphony Math computer-assisted, target instruction will be utilized for all students K-5. In addition, our interventionists will be front-loading Math instruction for our most fragile students in this category. Acceleration tutoring will be provided for all of our students working below grade level. Standards-based instruction, number talks, and differentiated small group instruction will be in place across the board, and monitored for fidelity.

Symphony Math was selected due to the strong monitoring component in the program. There are required checkpoints, and teachers are alerted when they need to check a student's instructional path, allowing for on the spot reteach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Acceleration tutoring is a research-based strategy to help our fragile students gain confidence, and accelerate more rapidly.

Standards-based practice, and reteach deficient skills to mastery are research-based strategies, and have allowed students to show success in the past three years.

Action Steps to Implement

Symphony Math pilot will be implemented with fidelity. Our entire instructional staff will be trained on the program, and learn to monitor student progress. Students will work for 45 minutes a week on this program.

Person Responsible Amanda Henleben (amanda.henleben@ocps.net)

Math PLCS and collaborative planning will take place weekly in order to vet and collaborate on standards-based instruction, assessment, and reteach.

In addition, 4 entire days of extra planning will be provided for each team. Coaches will prioritize these days to plan with teams.

Person Responsible Patty Harrelson (patty.harrelson@ocps.net)

Select teachers have been identified to attend district IMPACT trainings for Math content area. At these trainings, teachers have the opportunity to preview the upcoming curriculum units, and discuss best practices in their delivery models. All new to Spring Lake are attending, as well as those who are new to their grade level, and/or identified as a Tier 3 teacher.

Person Responsible Patty Harrelson (patty.harrelson@ocps.net)

Acceleration Tutoring will be provided twice a week for this targeted subgroup in Math.

Person Responsible Amanda Henleben (amanda.henleben@ocps.net)

Our team of interventionists are intentionally scheduled to support these lowest 25% students during core instruction. They will provide whole group instruction support, as well as on the spot reteach for them. They will also conduct small reteach groups targeting these students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 45% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). It also indicated that 50% of our students did not make a learning gain.

Measurable Outcome: The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 10 percentage points from 55% to 65% for our students ELA Learning Gains.

Monitoring: The reading growth of our students will be monitored by measurable outcomes to include: i-ready diagnostics, SIPPS mastery assessments, Early Interventions in Reading mastery check-outs, classroom walkthroughs, and standards based unit assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teach students in our lowest 25%, and any other non-readers in intermediate grades to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy above was selected because there is strong evidence to support the fact that teaching students to decode, analyze word parts, and practice fluency builds strong foundations and supports them in becoming fluent readers.

Action Steps to Implement

Purchase research-based instructional programs to help students learn to decode and build word attack skills. Provide PD and training for Intervention team and instructional paras.

Person Responsible Patty Harrelson (patty.harrelson@ocps.net)

Provide assessment materials and dates for Intervention Team to complete diagnostic assessments for our lowest 25%, and intermediate non-readers.

Person Responsible Patty Harrelson (patty.harrelson@ocps.net)

Have MTSS child study team use diagnostic data to place students in researched based supplemental reading intervention programs (EIR, and SIPPS). Our intervention team will provide daily sessions four days a week, with mastery checks monitored for progress.

Person Responsible Stacy Huntzinger (stacy.huntzinger@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.floridacims.org/SafeSchoolsforAlex), 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.

After comparing the Florida School Safety Dashboard's discipline data of Spring Lake Elementary, to discipline data of other schools across the state we found that Spring Lake's ranking is high in the category of violent incidents for the 2019-2020 school year. There were 534 students enrolled during this reporting year. Spring Lake ranked 1, 289 out of 1,389 elementary schools statewide on the School Safety Dashboard. Safe Schools for Alex ranks this as a high average for the school to discipline data across the state. Spring Lake reported 3.2 incidents per 100 students. This rate is greater than the elementary school rate statewide of 1.0 students per 100 students. This category is a primary area of concern that will be heavily monitored during the upcoming school year.

The secondary area of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year will be the rate of suspension. There were 20 total reported suspensions. Suspensions ranked 3.7 per 100 students, for the 2019-2020 school year. There were 534 students enrolled during this reporting.

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.

The school culture and environment will be monitored via the lens of behavior or discipline data with a School-wide Plan for Expectations. Our students' families will play an important role in the success of this plan. Students will be taught to put school-wide guidelines into action (i.e., classroom chill zones, visual expectations reminders throughout campus, ownership of their respective house values, and responsible behavior in common areas, as these are less structured environments.) We will keep parents informed of student responsibility via dojo, newsletters, and phone/all calls. The importance of teaching and re-teaching the expectations will remain ongoing throughout the school year, with character education, classroom and campus lessons, small group social skills training, Dean and SRO quarterly review of the Code of Student Conduct, and social emotional reminders and tips on morning announcements.

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

Staff- Staff will set and clearly define behavior expectations, and also explicitly teach and model those expectations.

Students- follow schoolwide expectations and the Code of Conduct consistently. Work collaboratively with your House members to earn points for positive behavior and work ethic.

Parents and Guardians- support and reinforce the Code of Conduct and Behavior expectations laid out for your child. Stay in communication with staff to keep students on the right path.