Springwood Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Springwood Elementary School

3801 FRED GEORGE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/springwood

Demographics

Principal: Sylvia Myers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/8/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (39%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Leon 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

Springwood Elementary School

3801 FRED GEORGE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/springwood

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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.

Our Mission is to provide students with a high-quality education in a safe, respectful, and inclusive environment that builds a foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision is a school community where all children feel loved, respected, and encouraged to develop to their fullest potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Landrum, Michael	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal provides school wide leadership, coordinates collaborative planning efforts, and facilitates progress monitoring and professional development. The Assistant Principal works intricately with the Principal and Instructional Coaches to help make decisions that impact the school community and student achievement.
Myers, Sylvia	Principal	The Principal ensures that both the vision and mission of the school are communicated to all stakeholders and provides school wide leadership. The Principal provides support to teachers and staff by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations, and feedback. The Principal works with all stakeholders to provide a positive learning environment that fulfills the academic goals of the school.
Swan, Lacacia	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach provides instructional support to classroom teachers in order to ensure rigorous standards based instruction is occurring. The Reading Coach works closely with the leadership team to disaggregate and disseminate data.
Hewett, Lee Ann	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach provides instructional support to classroom teachers in order to ensure rigorous standards based instruction is occurring. The Reading Coach works closely with the leadership team to disaggregate and disseminate data.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/8/2020, Sylvia Myers

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

488

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	81	69	69	79	68	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	22	20	22	15	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	9	5	12	3	13	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	40	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	35	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	21	25	29	43	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	12	12	14	13	24	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/14/2022

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	80	69	71	78	74	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	19	10	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
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	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	1	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
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	0	0	1	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	80	69	71	78	74	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	19	10	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
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	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	1	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
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	0	0	1	30	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	34%	57%	56%				47%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						44%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						34%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	40%	47%	50%				64%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	50%						65%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						33%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	27%	57%	59%				49%	52%	53%

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**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	61%	-10%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	56%	-15%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	60%	63%	-3%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	66%	0%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	61%	0%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	36	40	17	24	14	26				
BLK	27	45	46	37	46	38	14				
HSP	27			36							
MUL	62			54							
WHT	67	57		48	64		60				
FRL	29	47	53	36	55	42	17				

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	20	29		25	24		18				
BLK	29	45	50	27	25	8	21				
MUL	53			56							
WHT	38	36		43	18		42				
FRL	25	41	50	28	18	8	18				

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	21	25	24	34	48	30	30				
BLK	43	41	29	64	66	33	41				
HSP	38			54							
WHT	58	56		67	68		75				
FRL	44	45	30	62	65	31	50				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	276
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

A clear trend that has emerged is with our subgroup, students with disabilities. Since 2018, the students with disabilities' subgroup has not risen to the level required by ESSA, which is 41% proficiency in ELA and Math. Our progress monitoring showed a similar trend throughout the 2021-2022 school year with low proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2022 FSA and progress monitoring (STAR), our are need for the greatest improvement is in reading. At the end of the school year, our 2nd grade students were at 29% proficient according to STAR. This was only a 4% increase from the beginning of the year. Our 3rd reading scores were at 28%, 4th at 27% and 5th at 40%. Combined (2-4th), the proficiency of our students who will be in 3rd-5th grade in the 2022-23 school year is at 28%.

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

The contributing factors for the low reading achievement in grades 2-4 we would attribute to Covid learning loss. We also feel that we could improve how we are implementing Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2 interventions, as well as to continue to work on providing quality Tier 3 interventions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The area with the most improvement was Math Learning Gains of the lowest 25%. This group showed growth from 2021 (6% proficiency) to 2022 (35% proficiency).

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

Increased standards based instruction, small group teaching, and math interventions that targeted our students in the lowest 25%.

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

Teachers and instructional coaches will be working to increase standards based instruction, small group teaching, and intensive targeted reading interventions. Progress monitoring will happen bi-weekly in a concerted effort with teachers, instructional coaches and administration to ensure fidelity to quality instruction and research based learning strategies.

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.

To support proficiency and student learning gains we will have increased cooperative planning time, professional development, and vertical teaming. In addition, we will be providing professional development that focuses on high yield and research based learning 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 to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond are the incorporation of proven reading intervention programs such as Lexia, Heggarty, EIR, and Reading Mastery along with consistent progress monitoring

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	It is our desire that every student makes a year's worth of growth in all areas, especially reading skills. We saw a 2% increase in reading proficiency based on the FSA scores. In 2021, our students were 32% proficient in reading and in 2022, we increased to 34% proficiency. In 2022, our math proficiency was 40% and in 2021 it is 33%. We have a critical need to increase student achievement in this area
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The goal for Reading in 2023 is that we reach 45% proficiency in the 3rd, 4th and 5th grades, 50% in learning gains with 3rd grade retainees, 4th grade and 5th grade, and 50% in the lowest 25% in 4th and 5th grade. The goal for Math in 2023 is that we reach 50% proficiency, 55% in learning gains, and 50% in the lowest 25%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Our focus this year will be utilizing collaborative planning to create plans aligned with the standards and establish intended learning targets. Planning sessions will be each week, two times a week with an instructional coach and/or an administrator. Tiered supports for teachers, including but not limited to observations with feedback, modeling, observing peers, and/or professional development will also be provided. The frequency of observing the look-fors, including standards aligned instruction and the teacher's movement through the tiers and student data will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacacia Swan (swanl@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Our focus this year will be standards based instruction and high yield instructional evidenced based strategies such as increased use of progress monitoring, formative/ summative assessments, differentiated instruction, and planning lessons that are aligned to standards and learning targets and include academic vocabulary and higher order thinking questions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific	The rationale for selecting these specific strategies is that students need time to consolidate, transform and internalize information in order to process new knowledge. Our desire is to engage students at high levels of thinking that will produce deeper understanding. Teachers will plan together and use classroom assessments, district assessments, iReady, FAST, and STAR to track standards mastery.

**strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

1. Providing teachers with opportunities to plan collaboratively.
2. Provide tiered support for teachers based on observations and data.
3. Use progress monitoring data to differentiate instruction during intervention/enrichment and to monitor progress toward the school's reading goals.
4. Standards will be posted and clarified with students to not only understand what they are being asked to do, but to discuss the academic vocabulary in the standard.
5. Provide reading interventions to TIer 2 and Tier 3 students and monitor their data bi-weekly.

**Person
Responsible**   Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our students with disabilities are below the federal index of 41%. Currently they are at 30% and their target is 41%
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our intended outcome is to raise the achievement level of our students with disabilities (SWD) to 50% proficiency in math and reading.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments, STAR and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by the Resource, ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups. District instructional support will be provided by the district curriculum developers, as well as, the math and reading coach at Springwood, in order to develop educational strategies that target our students with disabilities. Resource, ESE, and classroom teachers will participate in administrative led data discussions on a monthly basis and track the progress of their SWDs. Teachers will plan collaboratively to create standards based instruction that meets the needs of our students in the SWD subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Landrum (landrumm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	By providing the resources, data, and planning time, teachers will be able to target students with disabilities and provide the required intensive interventions necessary for academic gains. Instructional coaching from the district developers and the school based coaches will provide the opportunities for teachers to have the professional development and support to make the desired gains. In addition, by identifying targeted students and closely monitoring their progress, we increase learning gains and proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Our desire is to engage our students with disabilities at high levels of thinking that will produce deeper understanding. Teachers will plan together and focus on high yield strategies that target differentiation and intervention.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Identify SWDs at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to a have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA and Math standards that students with disabilities struggled with on the FSA and address the instructional gap.
3. Develop targeted and intensive interventions.
4. ESE, Resource and classroom teachers will work closely with the instructional coaches to develop appropriate and impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible   Michael Landrum (landrumm@leonschools.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Fifty-four percent of the students that will be in 1st grade in the upcoming school year demonstrated proficiency according to progress monitoring data (STAR). Fifty-one percent of our upcoming second graders demonstrated proficiency in 1st. This would mean that we still have 47% of our students in 1-2nd grade that continue to struggle with foundational reading skills. We will continue to work on the implementation of Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2 interventions, as well as continuing to work on providing quality Tier 3 interventions, specifically in the areas of phonics and phonemic awareness.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

With 72% of our 3-5 not demonstration proficiency, we consider each grade level in 3-5 as in critical need. We will need to monitor the implementation of Tier 1 instruction more intently, ensuring that teachers are monitoring the effectiveness of instruction more frequently using formative assessments.

We will also continue to encourage and support structured collaborative planning amongst team members with administration and instructional coaches. We will also monitor Tier 2 interventions and small group instruction within the classroom. We will provide teachers with guidance as to what needs to happen in small groups based on formative and summative assessments throughout the school year. We will continue to provide targeted Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the scheduled intervention times according to our master schedule. Ongoing professional development as well as more frequent progress monitoring will be provided to support teachers. There will also be extended learning time outside of the regular school day to provide our students with additional instruction in areas of weakness.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

70% of students in Kindergarten will demonstrate proficiency according to the Early Literacy test at the end of the year.
70% of students in 1st grade will demonstrate proficiency according to the Early Literacy test at the end of the year.
60% of students in 2nd grade will demonstrate proficiency according to the STAR assessment at the end of the year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of students in 3rd grade will demonstrate proficiency according to the STAR assessment at the end of the year.
40% of students in 4th grade will demonstrate proficiency according to the STAR assessment at the end of the year.
45% of students in 5th grade will demonstrate proficiency according to the STAR assessment at the end of the year.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

- Formal and informal observations and walkthroughs
- Progress Monitoring (unit test, benchmark checklists, Lexia, iReady, STAR)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

K-2: SAVVAS, Ready, iReady, Lexia, Heggerty, EIR, and Reading Mastery
3-5: SAVVAS, Ready, iReady, Lexia, Bridge the Gap, and Corrective

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

K-2: SAVVAS and Ready (Addresses all areas of reading);iReady and Lexia targets areas of weakness in reading; Heggerty helps to support students with phonemic awareness, and Reading and EIR are interventions for phonics and phonemic awareness.
3-5: SAVVAS and Ready (Addresses all areas of reading);iReady and Lexia targets areas of weakness in reading; Bridge the Gap helps to support students with phonemic awareness, and Corrective is an intervention for students who are struggling with decoding.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teach the ELA standards with fidelity.	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net
Use progress monitoring data to differentiate instruction during intervention/ enrichment and to monitor progress towards our reading goals. The goal for Reading is that we reach 45% proficiency in the 3rd, 4th and 5th grades, 50% in learning gains with 3rd grade retainees, 4th grade and 5th grade, and 50% in the lowest 25% in 4th and 5th grade.	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net
Use iReady and STAR diagnostic data to create a plan for instruction and develop reading centers and interventions.	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net
Use data tracking to determine students' acquisition of standards.	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net
Provide students with reading passages on their independent and instructional levels.	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net
Provide cognitively complex tasks for all students.	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net
Have students to set goals and track their own progress.	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net
Develop and use a comprehensive writing plan.	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net
Provide reading interventions to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students and monitor their data bi-weekly	Myers, Sylvia, myerss@leonschools.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Springwood Elementary will strive to build a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved at all levels of decision making. We will have a parent liaison that will work to make connections with our parents and stakeholders by providing learning opportunities for parents and

stakeholders and by maintaining a welcoming and inviting school environment. We will also create a new parent resource room that is accessible for parents with instructional and parenting resources such as school supplies,books, guides, lists of resources, food pantry items, and videos. In addition, we have a volunteer coordinator who will work to involve more parents in volunteering and mentoring opportunities. We would like to increase our school volunteer hours for the 2022-2023 school year. In addition, We have a business partner liaison who is working with community members to support our positive school culture through new and innovative ways, such as community events. We are also building our PTO program to be a robust and active organization and outreach opportunity for the school. In addition, SAC will work to include more community members and stakeholders to reflect our school and community members.

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

Our stakeholders play a vital role in promoting a positive school culture and environment at the school. Our internal stakeholders include teachers, staff, Site Team, SAC, and PTO. Our teachers and staff are part of the school decision making body through Site Based Decision making process. Our SAC is comprised of parents and community members who have a vested interest in the success of Springwood Elementary students. SAC helps guide the decisions regarding the school in all aspects including the distribution and spending of funds for family and parental involvement. Our SAC provides ongoing input on family engagement, school improvement, and the yearly progress of the school. Our PTO also has input in the decisions regarding how funds for family engagement will be used, in addition to, helping raise additional school funds. Additional stakeholders include local businesses and faith organizations who assist us through donations and fundraising efforts that benefit our students directly.