Spring Creek Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spring Creek Elementary School

25571 ELEMENTARY WAY, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

http://spc.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jillian Fiora

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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 (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee 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 Elementary School

25571 ELEMENTARY WAY, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

http://spc.leeschools.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	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	88%

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 Lee 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.

Spring Creek's purpose is to collaboratively achieve personal and academic excellence in an engaging, safe, and trusting environment of shared leadership.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spring Creek's vision is to prepare our students for world-class learning.

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
Blackmon, Mary	Principal	Each leadership team member attends their assigned grade level PLC each week. During PLCs, the leadership team collaborates with team members to analyze data and create data. We host data chats 1x a quarter after iReady assessments with each PLC. Any questions, concerns or other information is shared in the leadership meeting. The principal is responsible for attending PLCs, reviewing the data and notes from the PLCs.
Weich, April	Assistant Principal	
Tubbs, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	
Somers, Stefany	Teacher, K-12	
Dooley, Cheryl	Curriculum Resource Teacher	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Jillian Fiora

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school
641

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
4

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	101	85	100	90	114	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	7	12	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	2	6	18	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	10	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	23	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	18	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	2	2	12	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 9/21/2021

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	79	96	89	108	153	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	12	8	16	37	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	0	6	6	7	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	6	6	5	29	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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

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	79	96	89	108	153	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	12	8	16	37	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	0	6	6	7	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	6	6	5	29	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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

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%	57%	57%	50%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	56%	58%	57%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	50%	53%	63%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	62%	63%	64%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	65%	62%	68%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	54%	51%	57%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	52%	53%	57%	54%	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	41%	58%	-17%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	62%	2%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	58%	-6%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	50%	4%	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.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/39	13/21.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/20	1/20	0/0
	English Language Learners	4/12.9	1/3.1	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/20.3	19/31.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/20	0/0
	English Language Learners	3/6.1	1/2	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4/4.2	14/14.4	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/2	1/2	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/4.3	13/13.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/20	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/2.2	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/22.1	37/34.6	56/50.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	1/11.1	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/2.2	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/9.7	31/29.2	51/46.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	5/14.3	6/16.7

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28/19.4	48/33.3	53/36.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/10.5	3/15.8	3/15.8
	English Language Learners	3/6.8	6/13.6	4/9.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/5.3	28/28	42/42.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/12.5	4/25
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/12.5	6/25

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31/32.6	41/42.3	48/47.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/8.3	3/25	1/7.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/7.7	6/20.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/13	27/28.7	50/49.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/16.7	2/15.4
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/4	5/17.2
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	23/25.8	51/54.8	63/63.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2	5/45.5	6/46.2
	English Language Learners	1/4.2	4/16	8/29.6

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	29	38	45	50	67	58	50				
ELL	32	60	57	56	71	73	42				
HSP	47	56	58	64	77	64	52				
WHT	69	77		85	69		77				
FRL	47	55	47	63	69	56	52				

	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	53	45	38	68	61	18				
ELL	30	58	68	43	57	56	29				
HSP	45	57	62	54	62	62	51				
WHT	80	70		73	70		80				
FRL	47	60	68	53	61	62	55				

	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	18	42	56	27	53	59	13				
ELL	26	59	67	50	65	63	21				
HSP	46	56	61	62	69	58	48				
WHT	71	61		71	58		93				
FRL	48	56	60	62	67	57	53				

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	60
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	55
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	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
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	54
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?

Trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas are that we are closing the gap with the state as demonstrated by our school grade. From 2017-2020 we increased our ELA proficiency from 45% to 50%. We increased our math proficiency from 53% to 67% from 2017 to 2020.

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

ELA is our greatest need based on 2019 state assessments. The data component that showed the lowest performance was third grade proficiency where our students were performing at 45% proficiency in 2020. Currently based off baseline iReady data 3rd graders were at 28% proficiency, our 4th graders are at 32% proficiency, and our 5th graders are 25% proficiency. Using progress monitoring data demonstrates that ELA is our greatest need.

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 that led to this need for improvement are COVID, quarantine, and data as reported by our iReady baseline. Another factor to the low performance is that many students are English language learners. Teachers struggle with the instructional guide standard pacing. New actions needed is more time for language learners to have more instruction in literacy skills and language learning.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in math.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement were high yield instructional strategies, small groups, after school tutoring, and highly effective teaching.

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

To accelerate learning we will continue to use the same strategies and will add reflex math, Kagan, Data Chats, and a new data wall.

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.

The professional development opportunities we will provide are Learning Walks with the Math Coach, model lessons with GO Math, Freckle training,Thinking Maps, Reading Endorsement classes taught by the Reading Coach, APPLES, ESE support from the district, and ESOL with SIOP strategies.

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

Additional services that will be implemented and sustained in the next year and beyond include morning interventions, lunch bunch, after school tutoring, resource teachers, Imagine Learning, Reflex math, small group instruction, Roaring Readers and Curriculum night. These services provide students and parents additional tools to support learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our critical need is based on multiple ESSA subgroups including our Hispanic and ELL students. In grades 3-5, the majority of students score below a level 3. Grade 3-5 proficiency - 47%. When the students are not proficient readers, this affects their ability to be successful in all academic areas. The major cause of our lack of proficiency is that the majority of the students at Spring Creek come from homes where a language other than English is spoken at home. 100% of the students at our school are economically disadvantaged. The students are lacking in vocabulary development and background knowledge.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in grades 3-5 will increase their ELA proficiency from 49% in 2020-2021 to 53% in 2021-2022 as determined by the Spring state standardized assessment.
Monitoring:	We will monitor our student progress through iReady, Imagine Learning, PLC, data chats, assessments, and exemplars. Daily interventions will be implemented through small group instruction, Read180, System44, lunch bunch, after-school tutoring, PE Waivers, and before-school small groups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The students who scored Level 1 or Level 2 will be given added daily instructional opportunities throughout the year through ELA intervention programs. Students will be required to complete 45 minutes of iReady reading instruction each week. Small groups will be formed based on exemplar data to provide focused instruction on standards students are struggling to master. Resource teachers will provide small group assistance in pull-out and push-in opportunities each day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 2020-2021 school year, there were 164 students in ELA intervention programs. Out of the 164 students, 96 students made a learning gain. The percentage of students who were in ELA intervention groups who also made a learning gain are as follows: 3rd grade: 56% 4th grade: 67% 5th grade: 53% Overall: 59%

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify the Level 1 and Level 2 students in grades 3-5.
2. Baseline test students to place them in appropriate intervention programs (i-Ready, Really Great Reading, Imagine Learning, Read 180, and System 44).
3. Identify the teachers to work with specific groups based on strengths and program expertise.
4. Provide support throughout the year through grades, reports, and teacher observation.
5. Student progress will be monitored through grades, reports, and teacher observation.
6. Added interventions are provided to students through additional targeted small-group instructional time before, during, and after the school day.

Person Responsible Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.net)

	#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our student demographic, we are focusing on proficiency in Science as determined by the FCAT 2.0 Science Exam. Giving students more background knowledge in science and multiple opportunities to interact with non-fiction texts will increase their reading achievement, as well as their science proficiency. One of the obstacles for our students at Spring Creek Elementary is that they come from homes where a language other than English is spoken at home. 100% of the students at our school are economically disadvantaged. The students are lacking in vocabulary development, as well as background knowledge.
Measurable Outcome:	The school will increase the percentage of students achieving a level 3 or higher on the FCAT Science from 56% to 59% as determined by the Spring FCAT 2.0 NGSSS state exam.
Monitoring:	This area will be focused through daily classroom instruction in science, while students also participate in Science specials within a 6-day rotation. Fifth-grade students will participate in an added STEM lab once a week during their additional 30 minutes of enrichment. We will monitor for science proficiency through the quarterly district exemplars and the FCAT administered at the end of the year. Science topics will be used for reading instruction during center time and a science after-school tutoring program for 5th-grade students will begin in the spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The 5h grade students will be given added instructional opportunities throughout the school year. Teachers will incorporate lessons from a variety of resources such as, C-PALMS, district created instructional guides, common planning, Performance Matters exemplars, Kagan strategies, thinking maps, science text-dependent questioning, and hands-on tactile activities. Standards reports will also be used to drive instruction and to spiral back.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our science proficiency is 7% higher than our ELA proficiency. Also, we are 10% higher than the district science proficiency. We believe this is due to the science enrichment provided by our science coach and science teachers. Providing focused lessons on standards and spiraling back to standards presented in grades 3 and 4 will allow students more exposure to topics and more opportunities to be successful.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule the 3rd, 4th and 5th-grade students to receive weekly standards-based instruction by our science coach. Lessons include hands-on investigations and differentiated activities.
2. All 5th-grade students attend an additional weekly science lab taught by the science coach and a science teacher.
3. Science packets are provided to all 5th-grade students on a quarterly basis to allow for additional practice of the science standards. Additional assistance is provided to students who struggle to complete the activity.
4. Daily science-based reading enrichment is provided to on-level 5th grade students.
5. A 40-minute block of science has been included in the daily master schedule for 3rd-5th grade students.
6. Implement a science boot camp to start in January.

Person Responsible	Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.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.

SafeSchoolsforAlex.org does not have any data for our school from last year. However, we are self reporting: from August 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021 we had 39 referrals and 1 SESIR. This year from August 1, 2021 to September 27, 2021 we have had 19 referrals and 2 SESIRs. Our data shows an increase in suspensions and referrals this year as compared to last at or school. The state report from Safe Schools shows that there was a decline in referrals and suspensions across the state at the elementary level.

We are primarily concerned with our students need for social emotional support. Our secondary concern is being able to be proactive and preventing our students from making poor decisions. We are committed to taking a proactive role and have applied for funding from Safe Schools to purchase and train our teachers in Zones of Self Regulation. We have already implemented Learning for Life K-5 with strategies to support Social Emotional Learning. Our school mental health team meets weekly to support our students and families that are in need and we offer strategies and outside agency resources. We have requested for a licensed mental health counselor to be a part of our school family so that we are better able to meet the needs of our students and families as well.

Finally, we will monitor discipline data through Focus Analytics and student notes to look for trends and areas that we can support our students, families, and teachers.

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.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an Open House. During our first SAC meeting staff share the vision, mission, and culture of the school. Parents, teachers, students, community members, and business partners, will participate in the comprehensive needs assessment by: parent-teacher conferences, student-led conferences, Curriculum Night, surveys, SAC meetings, informal communications, and home-school communications.

Stakeholders will participate as a result of invitations in bi-monthly school newsletters, School Messenger, Peach Jar, personal phone calls, and flexible meeting times. We enlist community business partners by reaching out to them through phone calls and letters, and we are open to partners who reach out to us, as well. Our business partners include the Bridge Fund, Publix, Costco, Lansdowne, Bonita Bay, First Watch, Publix, and McDonalds.

Input from stakeholders will be collected through activities such as surveys during parent involvement nights and SAC meetings. These communications will be in paper form or in person, allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and in simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan. The School Improvement Plan goals will be shared at the SAC meeting on September 25, 2019. Stakeholders will be given an opportunity to provide feedback. Our progress monitoring will be shared with stakeholders are quarterly SAC meetings. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

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

Stakeholders include school administration who is responsible for communicating with parents and faculty regarding our vision and mission. We have several committees that assist in building a positive culture and climate including our Sunshine committee and our PBIS team.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**