

Alachua County Public Schools

# Glen Springs Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Glen Springs Elementary School

2826 NW 31ST AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/glensprings>

## Demographics

**Principal: Ricky Bell**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Glen Springs Elementary School

2826 NW 31ST AVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/glensprings>

### 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 KG-5	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

### SIP Authority

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The Mission of Glen Springs Elementary School is to academically enrich all of our students and foster social skills to promote successful lifelong learners in a caring, safe environment.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Vision of Glen Springs Elementary is that all students will leave our school with

- the skills needed to be successful citizens
- a strong self-esteem
- high expectations
- respect for others
- and a desire to continue the quest for knowledge

### 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
Bell, Ricky	Principal	Principal serves as the instructional leader and practices shared decision making by: Assessing, evaluating, and monitoring specific and measurable goals for the instructional and learning needs of the school, teachers and students. He practices shared decision making by encouraging faculty and staff members to communicate with the leadership team, work collaboratively to plan meaningful and aligned lessons and activities; as well as, analyze data.
Zinger, Mary	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal serves as an instructional leader and practices shared decision making by: Facilitating professional development learning for teachers that align with our school goals and needs of our students. Additionally, she also provides meaningful and specific evidence based feedback to teachers following informal classroom walk-through and evaluations. Lastly, she serves as a support for content area and grade level teachers in understanding and aligning the standards to instructional practice.
Armstrong, Amanda	School Counselor	School Counselor serves as a school leader and practices shared decision making by: Providing Response to Intervention coordination across grade levels, leading and managing student Individual Educational Plans/ 504s and Educational Planning team meetings. Supporting content area and grade level teachers in understanding progress monitoring strategies within multiple measures of data collected.
Logan, Nancy	Instructional Coach	Title I and Florida Continuous Improvement Model Coordinator serves as a school leader and practices shared decision making by: providing remediation to students who, based on state assessment data, are in the lowest quartile in reading and math. She also facilitates data meetings across grade levels to engage in shared discussion about student growth and academic needs; as well as, targeted interventions.
Little, Pam	Behavior Specialist	Mrs. Little is in charge of discipline and positive behavior support. She assists with teachers struggling with classroom management as well.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/20/2022, Ricky Bell



**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.*

0

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

22

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

423

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

9

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

9

### 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	77	75	75	72	72	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	5	11	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	6	4	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	7	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	17	15	14	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	0	11	7	11	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

**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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/7/2022

**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	69	71	70	70	53	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	14	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	3	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	9	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

**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	5	6	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**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	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	69	71	70	70	53	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	14	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	3	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	9	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

#### 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	5	6	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

#### 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	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	53%	56%				57%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	56%	61%				53%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	43%	52%				42%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	49%	55%	60%				62%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%	58%	64%				50%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	46%	55%				32%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	48%	51%				54%	57%	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	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

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	70%	58%	12%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	53%	-2%
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	29		21	29	30	18				
BLK	20	28	38	18	45	38	26				
HSP	44	90		35	64						
MUL	55	90		67							
WHT	63	73		60	64		50				
FRL	38	54	50	39	51	44	36				
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	30			13							
BLK	33	47		17	6		19				
HSP	47			44							
MUL	71			43							
WHT	64	30		47	35		68				
FRL	42	38	30	26	4	9	24				
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	22	33	33	31	48	36	38				
BLK	32	35	39	35	21	22	30				
HSP	60	57		71	62						
MUL	59	54		53	46						
WHT	68	59	40	76	64	46	66				
FRL	35	36	32	47	40	30	37				

### 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
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	62
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Trends across grade levels and most core content areas show an upward trend from the 2022 FSA data. The one area where the trend is different is in the area of ELA for students that are on or above achievement. In 2021, 54% of students were proficient and in 2022 51% were proficient. We did however see a substantial drop in our Black subgroup for ELA. Our Black Achievement in ELA went from a 33 to a 20 and the Learning Gains went from 47 to 28. Our Math Learning Gains went up substantially (from 6 to 45) but our Achievement stayed relatively the same as it went from a 17 to an 18. Our schoolwide Science Achievement went from a 47 to a 50. Our Students with Disabilities improved in their data but are not meeting the Federal Index goal of 41.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in ELA Achievement. This is across the school and in our subgroups. While we did well in learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains, we are not improving our ELA students on achievement level.

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

We placed a heavy emphasis on interventions for our lowest quartile students last year which make substantial growth in our school grade point total. We did not place as high of an emphasis on our students in the 2.5 bucket and up. Now that we have better systems in place for our lowest quartile students, we can focus on bringing more students into the proficient category. We will make sure our 2.5 students are identified and focused on when it comes to Extended Day Intervention, Reading tutors, and Title 1 pull-out.

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

While our school grade was in the bottom quartile for the district for 2021, we tracked in the top half of the schools on our AIMS data. This was tracked through Illuminate and helped guide decisions. Our

lowest quartile students are what showed the largest growth. For ELA we went from a 33 to a 50 and for Math we went from a 8 to a 56. This growth also carried over to learning gains where we went from an ELA of 40 to a 64 and in Math went from a 21 to a 60.

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

During Pre-planning we spent several sessions going over the school grade formula and looked for areas of growth. There was a sense of urgency that we needed to pull up lowest quartile students and that if we did that it would carry over into other categories. From there we set up Extended Day Intervention and Title 1 pullout groups with an emphasis on our lowest quartile students. Every teacher was given a list of their lowest quartile students for progress monitoring and we utilized a data day where teachers spent the entire day creating interventions that were targeted towards our LQ students.

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

Aligning instruction to Benchmark Advanced and use of Common Assessment Progress Monitoring on Illuminate  
 2 Data Days  
 SIPPS for 3-5th Grade  
 UFLI for K-2  
 High Dose Tutoring for K-3  
 FAST Assessment Analysis  
 Extended Day Intervention with Lowest Quartile students as well as our Black students near a Level 3 on ELA or Reading  
 Continuous reminder of SIP goals during Monday Memo and Faculty Meetings

**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.**

2 Data Days  
 PLC on BEST from state  
 Illuminate Training  
 Focus on Dufours PLC guiding questions to drive data conversations:  
 How will we know if they learn it?  
 How will we respond when students do not learn?

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

IXL ELA and Math  
 Reflex Math  
 Write Score  
 UFLI Instruction  
 Small Group UFLI Interventions

**Areas of Focus**

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

:



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

For three years we have been below 41 percent for our Federal Index for Black students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

In math we would like our Black student achievement to go from 18 to 50.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Common Assessment Progress Monitoring through Illuminate on Unit Assessments will be monitored. FAST scores will also be monitored for growth and to compare to district averages. Monthly data chats for intermediate grades will be facilitated by our leadership team with a focus on Black student math data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Formative assessment and flexible grouping for remediation will be implemented. We will also pull our Black students during Title 1 pullout as well as Extended Day Intervention.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Those strategies are high leverage practices that are culturally responsive and designed to maximize achievement of all learners including students with disabilities. We want to utilize our intervention to focus on students that will directly affect our school goals.

**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. Baseline assessments administered
2. Illuminate Training for staff
3. Weekly/Monthly team monitoring of data
4. Job Embedded Coaching
5. Job Embedded PD
6. Title 1 Targeted Pullout
7. Extended Day Intervention

**Person Responsible**

Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our school wide ELA achievement was the only category on our school grade to drop. It went from a 54 to a 51.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We plan on increasing proficiency at each grade level by 3%.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will utilize Common Assessment Progress Monitoring through Benchmark Unit Assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Mary Zinger (zingermm@gm.sbac.edu)

We will utilize explicit systematic instructional practices such as:

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Benchmark Advance  
SIPPS  
High Dose Tutoring  
UFLI Foundations

Write Score Assessments will be provided three times a year to provide unbiased teacher feedback.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Structured literacy practices demand explicit systematic instruction. Benchmark Advance, SIPPS, High Dose Tutoring, UFLI Foundations all utilize explicit systematic instruction.

**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. Create Monthly Job Embed PD Calendar
2. Train High Dose Tutors in UFLI
3. Create schedule for High Dose Tutors trained in UFLI
4. Create Data Day Agenda and Implementation

**Person Responsible**

Nancy Logan (logannl@gm.sbac.edu)

**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**

Teachers will utilize district approved Benchmark curriculum for ELA instruction.  
 Teachers will utilize common planning to create lessons aligned to the standards.  
 Students struggling with decoding will be pulled for small group UFLI intervention with high dose tutors.  
 UFLI instruction will be implemented every day with fidelity for 30 minutes in all K-2 classes.  
 Write Score will be implemented 3 times a year to create vertical alignment in writing.

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

Teachers will utilize common planning to create lessons aligned to the standards.  
 Common Assessment Program Monitoring (CAPM) will be utilized through Benchmark Unit Assessments for clarity on student growth, trends, subgroup learning gains, and remediation.  
 Students struggling with decoding will be pulled for SIPPS intervention.  
 Write Score will be implemented 3 times a year to create vertical alignment in writing.

**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)**

50% percent of our students will score at proficiency.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

An increase in proficiency for FAST by 3 percent per grade level.

**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.

We will monitor STAR/FAST and DIBELS data with a comparison of PM1 to PM3. We will also input Benchmark Unit Assessments through Illuminate to best track progress of student growth as well as subgroup categories such as our Black students as well as our intervention groups.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Logan, Nancy, logannl@gm.sbac.edu

**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?

UFLI is an evidence-based practice that meets the needs of decoding in reading. Since 70 percent of reading issues deal with decoding, this is a highly effective reading intervention. Using district adopted curriculum aligned to the BEST standards is an evidence based practice to increase ELA achievement.

**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?

UFLI and Benchmark will be Tier 1 in practice as they will be taught to all students, but the interventions will specifically target the students not meeting proficiency. High dose tutoring has been proven to be a high leverage strategy for quick intervention.

**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
We will have 2 full Data days with grade level teams to review progress and areas of focus in relationship to CAPM, FAST, UFLI, and DIBELS.	Zinger, Mary, zingermm@gm.sbac.edu
Provide PD around Best Benchmarks, incorporated with literacy instruction.	Zinger, Mary, zingermm@gm.sbac.edu
Provide intervention support to address lowest quartile and identified achievement gap ESSA groups using district approved curriculum (UFLI, SIPS, etc.)	Zinger, Mary, zingermm@gm.sbac.edu
<p>Daily focus on Dufours PLC guiding questions model to drive data conversations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How will we know if they learn it?</li> <li>- How will we respond when some students do not learn?</li> </ul> <p>These questions are discussed during every Monday Memo, Faculty Meeting, and data discussion.</p>	<p>Bell, Ricky, bellre@gm.sbac.edu</p>
<p>Our Literacy Specialist will:</p> <p>Provide support (planning, modeling, co-teaching, resources) to teachers in a coaching cycle</p> <p>After a step of the coaching cycle is completed, update the literacy support team and discuss next steps</p> <p>Ongoing until 5/26/2022- Maintain communication with literacy support team on coaching cycle with teachers receiving services, revise coaching cycle and layers of support as needed</p>	<p>Zinger, Mary, zingermm@gm.sbac.edu</p>

**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.**

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment by taking a proactive approach utilizing the PBS (Positive Behavior Support) program. The purpose of PBS is to provide students and staff Positive Behavior Support to increase academic achievement as well as to establish a positive school culture. This is achieved through a variety of incentives offered on a daily, weekly and monthly basis. Students are able to earn "PAWS" tickets when they are observed displaying school wide expectations which are P - positive attitude, A - always be responsible, W - work together, S - show respect. Students are able to redeem these tickets through monthly grade level PBIS events that are coordinated by the teams and the BRT. Glen Springs also focuses on character traits and focuses on one character trait per month. Students are recognized for displaying the character trait of the month with breakfast with the principal and their names being displayed during the news. Teachers of the Month are selected by teachers that represent teachers going the extra mile to help all students. They are awarded a medal and have their name displayed on the marquee. At Glen Springs, we strongly believe that we should recognize and reward students and staff that are displaying positive behaviors and contributing to the overall positive school culture and environment.

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

The stakeholders in this mission include students, teachers, faculty and staff, volunteers, business partners, and our families. Students are the main focus of this mission. By displaying the school wide expectations and the character trait of the month, positive behavior is encouraged which has a positive impact on peers and schoolwide behavior as a whole. This results in more time being spent in class because students are displaying desired behaviors and are not being removed due to undesired behaviors. Teachers and staff play an important role through explaining, modeling and rewarding desired behaviors. Families are extremely important as they provide support, encouragement and redirection as needed. Our volunteers help classroom teachers create an environment where all students are provided their academic needs. Business partners meet the needs of the school that help create a positive school culture and environment. This can be through donations, volunteers, or through services. When all of the stakeholders are aware of what is desired and what is expected, a positive culture is promoted at the school.