Rock Springs Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rock Springs Elementary

2400 ROCK SPRINGS RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://rockspringses.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Teresa King

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2022

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	No
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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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

<div style="background:#283271;color:white">

Rock Springs Elementary

</div>

2400 ROCK SPRINGS RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://rockspringses.ocps.net/

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	No	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	70%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Darr, Kari	Principal	The Principal serves as an instructional leader at Rock Springs Elementary. She assists and observes teachers with data-based decisions making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. She meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier II and Tier III. The Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Leonard, Amanda	Other	The MTSS Coach collaborates with the other instructional coaches to facilitate and evaluate content standards and instruction by providing guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components. They also facilitate whole school screening programs that provide intervention services for those considered to be "at-risk" while implementing progress monitoring through the systematic collection and analysis plan. In response, as the needs of the student and teacher are identified, professional development is designed, presented, and support is provided.
McCarthy, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides guidance on the K-12 reading and math plan components, supports teachers with data-driven instruction, and coaches identified teachers daily. She also facilitates data collection for grades K-5. In addition, she conducts professional development with the faculty to ensure that best practices in all areas of instruction are utilized.
Shaver, Andrea	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist provides guidance on identified students with behavior needs, supports teachers with running behavior plans, and facilitates behavior data collection for grades PreK-5.
Heers, Lori	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist provides guidance on identified students with behavior needs, supports teachers with running behaviors plans and facilitates behavior data collection for grades PreK-5.
Hall, Karen	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves with the Principal as an instructional leader at Rock Springs Elementary. He assists and observes teachers with data-based decisions making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. The Assistant Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
DeLuca, Alicia	Staffing Specialist	The staffing specialist ensures that Rock Springs is compliant in meeting the needs as identified by quality IEPs and EPs by providing professional development for ESE and Gifted teachers in writing IEPs and EPs that are compliant with the current district rules and procedures. She also participates in the decision-making for intervention/enrichment by collaborating with the MTSS coaches and classroom teacher to ensure there is a plan in place to support student success.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hartsfield, Kristie	Reading Coach	The reading coach will provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to reading and writing instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/20/2022, Teresa King

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.*

1

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

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

688

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

10

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

7

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	115	123	109	128	94	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	10	60	42	35	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	23	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	2	23	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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	31	120	109	134	113	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	19	37	30	38	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	11	18	24	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	1	1	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	31	120	109	134	113	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	19	37	30	38	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	11	18	24	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	1	1	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	56%	56%				64%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						66%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						56%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	46%	50%				65%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						68%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						61%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	61%	59%				61%	56%	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	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

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	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	63%	-1%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	53%	6%
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	7	22	27	15	13	16	11				
ELL	30	45	22	30	57	38	23				
BLK	36	59		47	67		20				
HSP	38	46	21	43	55	37	42				
MUL	62			92							
WHT	55	50	29	53	48	36	67				
FRL	40	52	38	44	59	44	42				

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	22	32	17	20	42	27	18				
ELL	45	40	30	43	42	20	45				
ASN	100			73							
BLK	53	55		49	55		50				
HSP	51	46	33	47	53	41	56				
WHT	56	51		54	62		62				
FRL	52	45	25	42	41	11	43				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	47	48	43	76	68	25				
ELL	39	66	79	47	67	57	39				
ASN	64			82							
BLK	62	68	45	56	59	36	57				
HSP	61	69	70	59	67	61	55				
MUL	56	50		56	58						
WHT	68	64	38	76	74	71	69				
FRL	56	63	62	58	66	62	49				

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	48
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	77
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	48
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	46
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?

Data trends across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas show a decrease from the 2018-2019 school year in all categories.

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

The data component that shows the greatest need for improvement is the lowest 25% in ELA and math, For the 2018-2019 school year, 56% of the lowest 25% in ELA and 61 % in math made a learning gain. For the 2021-2022 school year, the lowest % decreased to 30% in ELA and 40% in math.

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

Our core instruction for ELA and math consistently works for 50% of our students overall. Given that our staff placements shifted throughout the year and coaches were covering classes often, this prevented coaches from conducting classroom walkthrough observations, coaching cycles, etc to support teachers with differentiated small group instruction. We have hired an ELA coach for the 2022-2023 school year. The ELA coach along with admin will run lead PLCs with a focus on small group instruction.

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

Given that we decreased in all components, the lowest drop was math learning gains with a 10% decrease.

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

Math intervention was 30 minutes of the scheduled day. This allowed the teacher time to ability group student based on needs and support closing student gaps.

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

In order to accelerate learning, an intense focus on targeted student learning will happen throughout the school year. This will include fluid small groups focusing on individual student needs. There will be an intensive focus on the MTSS process where data for students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 instruction will be consistently collected and
analyzed to provide targeted instruction to students.

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.

Teachers will attend professional developments based on small group for ELA and math. After the initial training, we will collect data trends and based other small group trainings based on data trends.

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

Rock Springs will use the acceleration model of instruction during after-school learning opportunities.

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.	Students for all subgroups will improve in ELA and math when teachers provide effective small group, differentiated instruction to meet learners needs based on data.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	SWD ELA proficiency will increase from 7% to 15% SWD Math proficiency will increase from 15% to 20% ELL ELA proficiency will increase from 30% to 35% ELL Math proficiency will increase from 30% to 35% Learning gains will not be measurable on FAST for the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The administration, school leadership team, and teacher will participate in ongoing data analysis in order to ensure students receive remediation and/or enrichment based on individual performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The school leadership team will support and monitor teacher implementation of small-group, differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	With additional instructional staff to support small group learning, students will be provided the opportunity to engage in targeted small group instruction based on individual needs. Students will engage in research-based interventions, and utilize the online resources from iReady which will provide students with instruction based on their greatest area of need.

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.

As needed, professional development will be provided in areas of ELA and math to ensure full understanding of the standards, effective instructional strategies, student engagement and active monitoring.

Person Responsible	Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)

Instructional coaches will provide strategies/modeling to teachers during collaborative planning that meet the needs of all learners in their classrooms.

Person Responsible   Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor the effectiveness of small-group, differentiated instruction and provide teachers will immediate and actionable feedback

Person Responsible   Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	By placing a priority on the MTSS process and establishing an understanding of expectations for implementation, the identification of students' needs will occur and can be addressed. In targeting the specific needs of our students, overall students achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	According to the 2021-2022 i-Ready End of Year (EOY) diagnostic, 51% of students in grades 2-5 at Rock Springs Elementary were proficient in ELA. By strengthening and monitoring the effectiveness of ELA MTSS process, our percentage of students in grades 2-5 reading on grade level will increase to 65% performing on grade level by the 2022-2023 i-Ready End of Year (EOY).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The desired outcome will be monitored through iReady diagnostic, common assessments and intervention data collected.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Leonard (amanda.leonard@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will provide intensive instruction (standards and tier reading instruction) with purposeful progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Identified students will receive intensive instruction based on their needs. Intensive instruction involves working with similar needs students in a small group setting using researched-based programs; such as SIPPS and iReady Toolbox. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

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.

Monitor MTSS data and hold meetings when needed to discuss student progress.

Person Responsible	Amanda Leonard (amanda.leonard@ocps.net)

Provide actionable feedback to teachers providing Tier instruction.

Person Responsible	Amanda Leonard (amanda.leonard@ocps.net)

Meet with the identified lowest 25% in grades 2-5 and discuss their progress.

Person Responsible	Karen Hall (karen.hall@ocps.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on our Panorama Survey Data, students lack a sense of belonging. This is a critical need to build a school community.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Decrease discipline referrals by 20% from the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Behavior calls are monitored by our Dean and discipline referrals are monitored by our Dean and Assistant Principal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Hall (karen.hall@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher will teach Health weekly. They will also hold brief morning meetings to build community within the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Supporting students sense of belonging through Health lessons and morning meetings will allow students to build community within their classrooms.

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.

Teachers will implement weekly health lessons, including facilitating morning meetings with all students.

Person Responsible	Karen Hall (karen.hall@ocps.net)

Administration will monitor discipline referrals and communicate with teachers regarding adjustments to student behaviors.

Person Responsible	Karen Hall (karen.hall@ocps.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

Based on the 2022 end of year iReady assessment, 51% of first graders performed below grade level. We will target reading foundational skills in reading intervention and small group, which will support an increase in students performing on grade level by 60%.

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

Based on the 2022 statewide standardized ELA assessment, 41% of 3rd graders scored a level 3 or higher and 47% of 5th graders scored a level 3 or higher. We will target reading foundational skills in reading intervention, which will support an increase in ELA proficiency by 10% for both grade levels.

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)

Rock Springs plans to increase students proficiency in grade 2 by 60% based on the new progress monitoring system.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Rock Springs plans to increase students' proficiency in grade 4 from 47% to 60% based on the new progress monitoring system. Rock Springs has shared raising 5th grade scores with receiving middle schools. These students will be placed in intensive reading classes.

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.

Studnets progress will be monitored through FAST, intervention program, common assessments and iReady diagnostic.

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

Darr, Kari, kari.darr@ocps.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. §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?

Teach students in our lowest 25%, and any other non-readers in primary and intermediate grades to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words through a research-based program, SIPPS. SIPPS will be used 4 times per week, with fidelity, for 30 minutes.

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?

After completing the SIPPS placement assessments, students deficient needs will be addressed. After students complete the common assessment, re-teaching will address student's learning gaps.

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
The Reading coach will provide professional development to address student needs.	Hartsfield, Kristie, kristie.hartsfield@ocps.net
The MTSS coach will track studnet progress in SIPPS and make adjustments as needed.	Leonard, Amanda, amanda.leonard@ocps.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.

In support of the OCPS 2025 Strategic Plan, we will implement the Caring School Community program school-wide. Teachers will plan to incorporate SEL strategies into their lesson plans when appropriate. SEL support provided to all students will lead to creating a safe learning environment for students in which they will be free to take greater risks in the classroom knowing that they have supportive structures in place. Students will be better equipped to effectively and ethically deal with daily tasks and challenges that occur at school. Implementation of this SEL support will create a nurturing environment, respectful and supportive relations, and shared norms and values for students to be able to increase proficiency and learning gains in all content areas.

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

Students - Work collaboratively together during learning and participate actively during Social Emotional Learning lessons.
Parents - Support their child's learning at home and reinforcing social skills. Participating in school-based activities and committees to support a positive environment.
Teachers - Provide Social Emotional Learning lessons and support class meetings to allow students to interact regarding non-academic issues. Work to provide collaborative opportunities for learning for

students.
Leadership Team - Create a welcoming environment as we greet every student into the school each day. Support the emotional needs of students, parents, and staff. Support and monitor Social Emotional Learning lessons and support class meetings.