Spring Creek Charter School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spring Creek Charter School

44440 SPRING CREEK RD, Paisley, FL 32767

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

Demographics

Principal: Wesley Locke

Start Date for this Principal: 5/25/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Lake 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

Spring Creek Charter School

44440 SPRING CREEK RD, Paisley, FL 32767

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	17%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Locke, Wesley	Principal	Facilitate, maintain and monitor all aspects of fiscal and academic business as it pertains to Spring Creek Charter School
O'Neal, Kim	Assistant Principal	Support and assist the principal to facilitate, maintain and monitors all aspects of fiscal and academic business as it pertains to Spring Creek Charter School
Ferrie, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Supports and assists the principal to facilitate, maintain, and monitor all aspects of fiscal and academic business as it pertains to Spring Creek Charter School
Watson, Melinda	School Counselor	Facilitate, maintain, and oversee the social, emotional, and mental health and well being of students VPK-3rd grade and all staff
	Attendance/ Social Work	Jade Schnovel: Facilitate, maintain, and oversee the social, emotional, mental health and well being of students in grades 4-8.
Odom, April	Reading Coach	Facilitate, maintain, oversee, and support staff professional development and student achievement with an emphasis on coaching Literacy in all academic and content areas
Warensford, Anita	Math Coach	Anita Warensford: facilitate, maintain, oversee, and support staff professional development and student achievement with an emphasis on coaching Math to provide opportunity for intervention and acceleration
Christner, VIrginia	Other	ESE School Specialist: facilitate, maintain, and oversee all aspects of the Exceptional Student Education Program
Wiehe, Rebecca	Other	MTSS and Testing oversight, facilitation, monitoring, and professional development/trainings

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 5/25/2015, Wesley Locke

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

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

528

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

3

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

4

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	72	73	71	82	62	72	46	39	33	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	23	31	23	25	31	31	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	3	3	9	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	17	16	9	8	14	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	7	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	0	5	6	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	23
	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	8	9	16	29	31	23	15	21	0	0	0	0	152

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	5	2	4	2	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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

Tuesday 7/6/2021

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	66	65	71	55	69	77	45	38	42	0	0	0	0	528
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	4	3	6	8	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	17	19	8	15	6	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	27	29	3	9	5	0	0	0	0	100
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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				50%	68%	61%	47%	67%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	63%	59%	46%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	56%	54%	41%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				49%	70%	62%	56%	69%	61%
Math Learning Gains				49%	65%	59%	56%	60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	54%	52%	51%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				47%	59%	56%	50%	65%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				71%	83%	78%	61%	77%	77%

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	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	59%	-3%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
06	2021					
	2019	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
07	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	52%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

				MATH		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	40%	62%	-22%	62%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	61%	-10%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	57%	-16%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
07	2021					
	2019	60%	58%	2%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	39%	-39%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	48%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	71%	0%	71%	0%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	85%	52%	33%	61%	24%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Benchmark Data including STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and STAR Math were utilized as the benchmark progress monitoring tool for data meeting throughout the course of the year. Other progress monitoring tools used are: Being a Reader and SIPPS placement and mastery assessments for

reading foundation skills, Write Score writing assessments, and Achieve 3000 Level Set assessments for middle school intensive reading courses.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	20	29
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8	12	28
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	54	44
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	34	40
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	18	27
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	19	21
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	23	28
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	18	23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	30	44
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	28	39
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			38
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	24	21
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	20	19
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	20	23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	19	23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	19	21
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	21	19
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			22
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	15	26	21	14	47	48	9				
ELL	19	31		43	75						
HSP	41	48		38	64		40				
WHT	45	47	31	48	53	43	54	67	64		
FRL	40	42	23	38	52	43	44	67	44		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	52	46	25	38	31	24				
ELL	25	53		25	29						
HSP	34	56	50	30	35	15	25				
WHT	53	53	44	52	51	39	51	76	83		
FRL	46	53	48	47	48	36	42	80	92		

	2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	27	32	26	40	31	18				
ELL	21	40		36	60						
HSP	41	38	46	39	58	71	32				
WHT	48	49	41	59	56	50	55	62	83		
FRL	43	44	38	54	55	52	46	54	92		

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	49
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	42
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	
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	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	50
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	44
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?

Looking at the state assessment and benchmark data from 2019 to 2021; In grades 3-5 we are noticing a drop in percentages (above 50%) at grade level for both ELA and Math of students working at grade level proficiency. Percentages above 50% for proficiency pick back up once we approach middle school grade levels. This has caused leadership to be proactive with BEST standard training, changing the way we approach our Tier 1 core curriculum in ELA and Math, providing acceleration and intervention block plans to master schedules, and implementing new resources and curriculum.

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

Foundation instruction for all grades K-8 in both Math and ELA have the highest focus need. Special attention has been placed on Math this year knowing that our core curriculum for mathematics is in need of a switch for the coming 21-22 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 a high need of foundation skills in ELA and Math include: COVID-19 school closures, absenteeism, quarantine of both staff and students, need for curriculum changes in both ELA and Math, lack of an intervention block for math foundation skills, high poverty rate, lack of parental engagement.
New Actions to be taken: master schedule changes to include intervention block for ELA and Math Foundational Skills 4 times a week for at least 30 minutes, professional development to include focus on new curriculum additions (PATHS UnBoundEd, Achieve 3000, Center for the Collaborative Classroom, BEST standards with focus on creating instructional tasks to align with standards)

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

The most improvement in data after looking at progress monitoring (STAR and Achieve 3000 Level Set assessments) was our percent of grade level proficiency at or above grade level in middle grade ELA. All middle grades made at least 50% at proficiency or above for ELA.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement were new curriculum implemented PATHS for Career and College as well as Achieve 3000 for Intensive Reading courses.
Actions taken: Professional Learning Communities with a partner school for PATHS implementation, Coaching cycles and monitoring of PATHS ELA curriculum, intensive reading course focused on goal tracking with Lexile Levels in Achieve 3000, opportunities to do both Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction in a longer course period with more instructors for small groups

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

We will implement intervention blocks this school year for both ELA and Math in K-8, four times a week for 30 minutes. We also will continue the use of tackling secondary foundation reading needs by use of Achieve 3000 for intensive reading and establishing an intensive math course for middle school using systematic explicit instruction in small groups with an increase in instructional staff support.

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.

Planned Professional Development Opportunities Provided to to support teachers in the 21-22 school year include: Responsive Classroom, Center for Collaborative Classroom SIPPS and Being a Reader, Achieve 3000 Foundations and Data Tracking, Write Score implementation, and BEST Standards in Math and ELA.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement the following will be continued: professional development series for curriculum utilized, professional learning communities, coaching cycles with reading and math coaches, intervention and acceleration blocks for foundational skills in ELA and Math, and progress monitoring using formative assessments for data chats throughout the year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through daily common planning and dedicated 1/2 day blocks once every five weeks, teachers and support staff will better understand, plan, deliver, differentiate and assess BEST standards-based instruction in ELA and Math content areas for all students. This is a critical need considering our data has declined since 2017 in both ELA and Math when reviewing both STAR benchmark assessments and FSA. FSA for the 20-21 school year determined the following percentage scoring below a level 3: 3rd grade 55%, 4th grade 65%, 5th grade 57%, 6th grade 49%, 7th grade 49%, 8th grade 49%. STAR spring benchmark indicated that 62% of students in K-2nd grade were performing below grade level. Core curriculum planning adjustments, BEST standards knowledge, and formative assessments to drive instruction during PLC and coaching cycles will help all staff to reach this goal.
Measurable Outcome:	*75% or more students scoring on or above grade level by the end of the year on STAR Reading with students scoring Level 3 or higher on state assessments
Monitoring:	Planning will be monitored by coaches and administration to assist with implementation of BEST standards. STAR Reading will be administered beginning/middle/end of year. Data will be analyzed by the teachers and leadership team at least quarterly. Professional development on BEST standards will be ongoing with follow up activities provided by coaches and admin throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim O'Neal (onealm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will work in grade level and vertical communities with an intense focus on student learning, collaboration, and results built upon the foundation of BEST. As teachers plan for standards based instruction through establishing the purpose, and instructional best practices, teacher effectiveness will increase. Data chats at PLC will determine if we are on track to meet our goal or provide opportunity to intervene.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers work collaboratively with a focus on student learning, results, and best practices for teachers, then they will ensure all students receive a BEST aligned curriculum in ELA and Math.

Action Steps to Implement

coaching cycles focused on implementing BEST

Person Responsible	April Odom (odoma@lake.k12.fl.us)

grade level and vertical collaboration with an intense focus on BEST alignment

Person Responsible	Kim O'Neal (onealm@lake.k12.fl.us)

data analysis and progress monitoring of STAR scores (BOY/MOY/EOY)

Person Responsible	Kim O'Neal (onealm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Professional development for instructional staff tied specifically to using BEST ELA standards and text to create spotlight benchmarks tasks with opportunity for interconnecting benchmarks. This "stacking" of benchmarks will provide teachers information needed to create tasks using grade level book lists in BEST

and the current curriculum to create tasks to use in instructional practice that have reading, writing, talking, and listening opportunities tied to the standards.

Person Responsible   Kelly Ferrie (ferriek@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School wide progress monitoring and assessment data indicates a need for students to possess a stronger foundation in math facts as well as the ability to apply conceptual and procedural knowledge.
Measurable Outcome:	*75% or more students scoring on or above grade level by the end of the year on STAR Math
Monitoring:	Instructional coach and administrative participation in collaborative planning, data analysis, classroom learning walks and progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim O'Neal (onealm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will work in grade level and vertical communities with an intense focus on student learning, collaboration, and results. As teachers plan for standards based instruction through establishing the purpose, authentic literacy, and instructional best practices, teacher effectiveness will increase.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers work collaboratively with a focus on student learning, results, and best practices for teachers, then they will ensure all students receive a BEST aligned curriculum in Math.

Action Steps to Implement

coaching cycles focused on math

Person Responsible   Anita Warensford (warensforda@lake.k12.fl.us)

grade level and vertical collaboration with an intense focus on Math

Person Responsible   Anita Warensford (warensforda@lake.k12.fl.us)

data analysis and progress monitoring of STAR Math scores (BOY/MOY/EOY)

Person Responsible   Kelly Ferrie (ferriek@lake.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development focused on BEST math standards focusing on: introduction to the new standards, the mathematical thinking and reasoning standards look-for document in instructional practice, and the horizontal and vertical alignment of standards using the Best Instructional Guide (BIG-M) for mathematics.

Person Responsible   Kelly Ferrie (ferriek@lake.k12.fl.us)

30 minute intervention block for math at least 3 times a week for grades K-5); intensive math for grades 6-8

Person Responsible   Kim O'Neal (onealm@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Historically, attendance is a challenge and Early Warning Signs indicate the same at 37% with >10% absences.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to reduce the 37% of students with more than 10% absences to 25% or less.
Monitoring:	School Counselors track data weekly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melinda Watson (watsonm1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School to parent communication will be used to decrease the amount of absences a student has.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support school to parent communication, there should be a decrease in the number of absences a student has.

Action Steps to Implement

Track attendance data, initiate home contact, assist with removing barriers, and establish communication.

Person Responsible	Melinda Watson (watsonm1@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.

Spring Creek Charter school for the 19-20 school year ranked number 245 out of 313 combination schools in the state with 2.3 incidents per 100 students, which classified the school as a high rank. Areas of concern that Spring Creek is continuing to monitor are focus on parental involvement through the family engagement plan, creating and maintaining the school culture using Responsive Classroom Practices and professional development for staff, and counseling needs of students with 2 certified counselors on campus in addition to outside providers based on student need. The leadership team including counselors and ESE supports will track data and report at leadership team meetings throughout the year to provide intervening solutions to improve numbers. Teachers will use the Responsive Classroom social-emotional practices within their classrooms which will be monitored using the Responsive Classroom walk-through tool by both coaches and administrators to be proactive in our approach to discipline.

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.

All Spring Creek Charter School (SCCS) personnel are dedicated to the safety, security and well being of our school family. Personnel purposefully create and explicitly teach to an extended campus that is safe and supportive to not only the academic needs of students but also the life needs of personnel, students, families and community. SCCS utilizes the Responsive Classroom (RC) approach to explicitly teach, model, implement and follow through with social emotional learning for all students, staff and stakeholders. Professional development funding is deliberately set aside for all staff to be trained in RC. Through ongoing training, all stakeholders benefit from a school culture built on caring, assertion, responsibility, empathy and self control.

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

SCCS has on staff two school counselors who are dedicated to the well being and mental health of students, staff and community. The School Guidance Plan utilizes whole group, small group and individual counseling as well as community workshops . The plan also includes working concurrently with outside agencies for mental health support as necessary.
The Charter Board is the acting SAC. The Board is consulted regularly for input and feedback regarding creation and implementation of governing plans. The Spring Creek PTO is the parent based group who is also consulted for input. All stakeholders have access to bring forth any issues or concerns to these groups or administration.
Through the use of Title I funds Spring Creek purchases the OneCall Now call out system to communicate with families and community regarding school events as well as important messages.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$18,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0631 - Spring Creek Charter School	Title II		$18,000.00

		Notes: Professional Development for Center for the Collaborative Classroom Instructional Materials including Being a Reader new edition, SIPPS new edition, and new additions to Making Meaning for task building and standards alignment	
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation**	**$0.00**
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$18,000.00**