

Seminole County Public Schools

Spring Lake Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spring Lake Elementary School

695 ORANGE AVE, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0401>

Demographics

Principal: Debbie Jose

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

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)	83%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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 Seminole 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	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spring Lake Elementary School

695 ORANGE AVE, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0401>

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	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole 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.

SCPS Mission Statement: The mission of the Seminole County Public Schools is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. Parent and Family Engagement Mission Statement: Spring Lake Elementary School endeavors to provide ongoing encouragement, information and opportunities for every family to play a valuable role in the education of their children. Parents and teachers will collaborate in a cooperative environment where all parties feel validated and work towards preparing all students to become responsible, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Model School for Teaching and Learning Vision: Spring Lake Elementary will create a self-sustaining model of advanced teaching, learning, and instructional leadership. It will become a place where other educators go to observe best practices in standards-based classrooms. Spring Lake will exemplify excellent teaching and evidence-based instructional practices that result in high levels of achievement for all students. Vision for Rigorous Instruction: Spring Lake classrooms are places where all students engage in high-complexity, team-centered tasks to achieve autonomy and high levels of learning through perseverance and productive struggle.

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
Mitchell, Kelly	Principal	SIP, Low Quartile, SST, Teacher Feedback, PBS, Emergency Response, Teacher/Staff Evaluations, PD, PLCs, PTA, Budget, SAC, Communication
Alchin, Danielle	Assistant Principal	SIP, Low Quartile, Teacher Feedback, PBS, Emergency Response, Teacher Evaluation, Progress Monitoring, PD, PLCs, Climate Surveys, Calendars, SAC, ESSER/Tutorial Programs, Textbooks
Cashion, Kellie	Assistant Principal	MTSS, SIP, Low Quartile, Teacher Feedback, PBS, Emergency Response, Teacher Evaluations, PD, PLCs, Calendars, SLC, CSM
Mitchell, Latisha	Attendance/Social Work	MTSS, Truancy, Social Skills/SEL Lessons, Behavior Interventions, Families in Need, Home-School Liaison, Title 1
Lind, Nicole	Instructional Coach	MTSS, SIP, Data Monitoring, Low Quartile, Peer Feedback/Mentor, PD, PLCs, Tutorial Programs
Berry, Kammi	Other	PBS, Emergency Response, Staff Evaluations, Climate Surveys, PTA, Families in Need, Calendars, Business Partners, Dividends, Title 1, Testing Coordinator, Tutorial Programs, Newsletters
Tinsley, Lillian	School Counselor	MTSS, PBS, Guidance Services, SST, Behavior Interventions, Crisis Support, Families in Need, Title 1
Bonomo, Ilaria	Instructional Coach	MTSS, SIP, Data Monitoring, Low Quartile, Peer Feedback/Mentor, PD, PLCs, Tutorial Programs

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/2/2018, Debbie Jose

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.*

0

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

563

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

18

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

7

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	99	81	81	100	101	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
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	3	7	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	17	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	20	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

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	2	0	2	9	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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

Monday 8/30/2021

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	74	83	77	105	112	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
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	3	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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

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	2	4	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	74	83	77	105	112	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
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	3	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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

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	2	4	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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				46%	67%	57%	46%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	61%	58%	48%	58%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	51%	53%	57%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	70%	63%	47%	68%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	66%	62%	34%	62%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	50%	51%	15%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	62%	53%	61%	66%	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	48%	67%	-19%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	65%	-27%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	64%	-17%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	71%	-21%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	34%	72%	-38%	64%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	65%	-13%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	62%	-23%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic Assessments were utilized to progress monitor*:

- ELA – Grades 1-5
- Mathematics – Grades 1-5

In Grade 5 Science, teacher based formative assessments were used for progress monitoring. Data is unavailable for these assessments.

*Reported data is based upon having 10 or more students in the subgroup. Less than 10 students will be reported as 0.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/27%	28/38%	44/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/25%	23/40%	32/55%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18%	5/36%	6/43%
	English Language Learners	0	0	05/36%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/29%	32/46%	40/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/22%	26/47%	31/54%
	Students With Disabilities	4/36%	5/42%	6/43%
	English Language Learners	0	1/8%	4/29%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26/36%	29/42%	40/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/32%	22/41%	28/50%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	1/17%	2/25%
	English Language Learners	1/5%	2/13%	4/24%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21/33%	28/41%	40/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/29%	22/42%	28/52%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	1/20%	2/25%
	English Language Learners	1/8%	4/25%	9/53%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14/17%	18/20%	33/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/12%	11/15%	23/29%\$
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	2/14%	2/12%	8/44%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14/17%	26/30%	55/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/16%	17/24%	39/51%
	Students With Disabilities	0	1/11%	0
	English Language Learners	1/6%	2/11%	10/56%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/18%	27/28%	34/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/17%	20/25%	24/25%
	Students With Disabilities	2/8%	3/14%	3/13%
	English Language Learners	3/14%	4/17%	4/14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23/24%	35/37%	40/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/22%	25/36%	33/39%
	Students With Disabilities	3/14%	3/15%	6/25%
	English Language Learners	6/29%	7/32%	7/28%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24/38%	32/50%	39/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/33%	22/44%	27/56%
	Students With Disabilities	0	1/14%	3/43%
	English Language Learners	3/33%	4/44%	4/40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32/55%	34/56%	41/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/58%	26/57%	32/68%
	Students With Disabilities	3/50%	3/43%	4/50%
	English Language Learners	4/44%	3/33%	4/44%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	21	50		23	33		55				
ELL	44	50		58	63		60				
BLK	37	50		30	33		35				
HSP	38	56		48	58		58				
WHT	61	36		63	67		71				
FRL	42	52	44	46	51	6	51				
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	20	38	30	22	43	37	31				
ELL	28	38	30	36	42	41	17				
BLK	41	48	30	37	58	47	38				
HSP	42	42	31	43	47	38	36				
WHT	59	60		58	54		58				
FRL	42	43	31	42	50	40	38				
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	43	62	23	31	9					
ELL	33	41	67	39	33	27					
BLK	43	44		44	34	13	53				
HSP	44	50	70	43	30	20	61				
MUL	67			73							
WHT	50	43		54	36		68				
FRL	45	49	58	45	33	17	59				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	59
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	
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	60
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	46
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?

The performance of English language learners and students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

The achievement and learning gains of English language learners and students with disabilities demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Factors contributing to the low performance of English language learners and students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need

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

Progress monitoring data reflects improvement for ELA and mathematics at all grade levels.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student learning.

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

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support; and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increasing academic achievement of English language learners and students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome: Increase achievement and learning gains for English language learners and students with disabilities.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Mitchell (kelly_mitchell@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Student owned progress monitoring
 Low 30% Monitoring
 High Level 1 and High Level 2 Monitoring
 Low Level 3 Acceleration
 Collaborative Data Driven PLCs
 Tutoring
 See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible Kelly Mitchell (kelly_mitchell@scps.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improving Reading/ELA instruction for all students. FSA achievement data reflects that less than 50% of students scored a level 3 or above on the 2021 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome will be an increase in the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above on the spring 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA and iReady outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Mitchell (kelly_mitchell@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data.
 Utilizing results of DRA and iReady diagnostics to design reading acceleration support for students.
 Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions.
 Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction.
 Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block.
 Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.
 See Seminole County Public Schools' School Improvement Plan for additional details.

Person Responsible Kelly Mitchell (kelly_mitchell@scps.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Based upon the Safe Schools for Alex website, Spring Lake ranks #212 out of 1,395 elementary schools in the state and #10 out of 34 elementary schools in SCPS. There were .1 incidents per 100 students, which is less than the statewide average of 1 per 100 students. A primary area of focus for the upcoming school year will be monitoring the number of suspensions. According to data on the website, the number of in-school suspensions increased from 18-19 to 19-20 from 41 to 55. The number of out-of-school suspensions increased from 18-19 to 19-20 from 22 to 24. School administration, guidance staff, and teachers will work together to implement SEL lessons, programs for school-wide Positive Behavior Support, and individual MTSS intervention plans for behavior.

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.

Spring Lake Elementary is a model school for Positive Behavior Support (PBS). A variety of procedures are in place to build a positive school culture and environment, including a school-wide system for class and grade-level House Points, Magnificent Manatees, and Staff and Students of the Month. Additionally, school-wide common expectations of the Three Bs: Be Safe, Be Respectful, and Be Responsible are incorporated into the morning news show and reviewed with students daily.

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

The Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Committee is comprised of staff members representative of different grade levels and areas within the school to allow for feedback and input from a variety of stakeholders. The School Advisory Council (SAC) contains staff, parent, and community representatives to provide an avenue for input and collaboration on topics impacting a positive culture within the school. Community business partners, such as Advent Health, also provide contributions to support the school environment and programs, such as the food pantry for families in need of support.