

Hillsborough County Public Schools

New Springs Schools School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 20 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 20 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 22 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 24 |

New Springs Schools

2410 E BUSCH BLVD, Tampa, FL 33612

<http://newspringsschools.org>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of New Springs Schools is to provide students with a well-rounded, STEM focused, inquiry-driven K through 8 education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school vision is to construct a data informed program that engages and motivates students to invest their talents, energy, and enthusiasm to participate and excel in academic and extracurricular areas. At New Springs, we aim to create a culture where our stakeholders strive for continuous improvement, persistent innovation, positive response to change, and a commitment to incessant growth in student learning. Our problem-solving leadership team will continuously use technology tools to monitor, review, and analyze students' performance data particularly in Reading and Mathematics, and act timely to provide the most effective instructional interventions for students at risk of failing. To maximize students' use of instructional minutes as well as to build positive school culture, we also aim to reduce detention and suspension rates by implementing positive behavior support systems and alternative responses to student misconduct.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Tekin, Oguz | Principal | |
| Lewis, Marsha | Assistant Principal | |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Student Performance Data is to be reviewed monthly and shared with staff quarterly.

Teachers meet bi-weekly in their teams to review student data for their grade level and review/adjust annual and weekly plans for instruction and interventions.

Parents are notified and provided information how to have access to the school improvement plan. They are able to provide their concerns and questions during schoolwide parent meetings such as title-1 parent meeting and SAC meeting.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School administration will review student progress monitoring data, observe classroom instruction, and review the SIP each quarter to identify and discuss potential areas of opportunities for growth.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 84% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | Yes |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 26 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 12 | 37 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 12 | 24 | 24 | 19 | 23 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 32 | 233 |
| Course failure in Math | 14 | 12 | 18 | 26 | 24 | 37 | 35 | 25 | 24 | 215 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 6 | 16 | 15 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 27 | 160 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 14 | 12 | 18 | 19 | 16 | 27 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 145 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 6 | 16 | 15 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 27 | 160 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 20 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absent 10% or more school days | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more school days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 31 | 51 | 53 | 32 | 51 | 55 | 33 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 45 | | | 41 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47 | | | 48 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 31 | 50 | 55 | 31 | 41 | 42 | 22 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 28 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 69 | | | 44 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 29 | 48 | 52 | 36 | 48 | 54 | 33 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 55 | 65 | 68 | 49 | 57 | 59 | 35 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 79 | 70 | 70 | 61 | 51 | 51 | 45 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 83 | 74 | | 44 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 33 | 53 | | 68 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 47 | 52 | 55 | 32 | 73 | 70 | 43 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 302 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 46 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 463 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 20 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 24 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | 32 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | Yes | 2 | |
| FRL | 43 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 28 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 38 | Yes | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 46 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | 51 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 32 | Yes | 1 | |
| FRL | 46 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 31 | | | 31 | | | 29 | 55 | 79 | | | 47 |
| SWD | 5 | | | 14 | | | | | | | 3 | 40 |
| ELL | 14 | | | 18 | | | 17 | | | | 4 | 47 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | | | 35 | | | 27 | 45 | | | 5 | |
| HSP | 27 | | | 22 | | | 24 | 56 | 67 | | 7 | 50 |
| MUL | 27 | | | 36 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 33 | | | 52 | | | 36 | | | | 3 | |
| FRL | 31 | | | 31 | | | 29 | 55 | 79 | | 7 | 47 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 32 | 45 | 47 | 31 | 61 | 69 | 36 | 49 | 61 | | | 32 |
| SWD | 5 | 38 | | 14 | 50 | | | | | | | 33 |
| ELL | 23 | 40 | 35 | 23 | 56 | 78 | 20 | 35 | | | | 31 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 32 | 41 | 58 | 32 | 66 | 68 | 37 | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 51 | 52 | 30 | 61 | 76 | 34 | 53 | 40 | | | 28 |
| MUL | 36 | 64 | | 36 | 67 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 24 | 30 | 20 | 28 | 52 | | 40 | | | | | 32 |
| FRL | 32 | 45 | 47 | 31 | 61 | 69 | 36 | 49 | 61 | | | 32 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 33 | 41 | 48 | 22 | 28 | 44 | 33 | 35 | 45 | | | 43 |
| SWD | 13 | 27 | | 21 | 18 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 37 | 53 | 16 | 39 | 56 | 7 | 10 | | | | 43 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 39 | 41 | 19 | 25 | 30 | 24 | 32 | 46 | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 36 | 50 | 18 | 24 | 36 | 37 | 32 | 29 | | | 49 |
| MUL | 44 | 50 | | 31 | 10 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 33 | 45 | | 41 | 59 | 80 | 40 | | | | | 40 |
| FRL | 33 | 41 | 48 | 22 | 28 | 44 | 33 | 35 | 45 | | | 43 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 53% | -25% | 54% | -26% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 47% | -1% | 47% | -1% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 27% | 44% | -17% | 47% | -20% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 54% | -26% | 58% | -30% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 47% | -19% | 47% | -19% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 46% | -16% | 50% | -20% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 26% | 53% | -27% | 54% | -28% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 36% | 4% | 48% | -8% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 55% | -22% | 59% | -26% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 19% | 59% | -40% | 61% | -42% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 21% | 57% | -36% | 55% | -34% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 53% | -29% | 55% | -31% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 41% | -9% | 44% | -12% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 22% | 47% | -25% | 51% | -29% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 55% | 27% | 50% | 32% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 64% | -12% | 66% | -14% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 4th grade Math. The contributing factor may have been ineffective tier I instruction, and inadequate instructional coaching.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Performance in 4th Grade Math showed the greatest decline. The decline may have resulted from lacking tier I instruction, instructional coaching, and newly adapted curriculum.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The component with the greatest gap when compared to state average was 4th Grade Math.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The component that showed the most improvement was Algebra 1. After school tutoring, Math paraprofessional supports, weekend studies, regular parent conferences were some of the actions that we implemented.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

1. Math performance in 4th and 8th grades
2. ELA performance for current 5th and 6th grades

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

- Student performance in Mathematics
- Student Performance in ELA
- Student attendance
- Student suspensions

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase the number of ELL students scoring 41% or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the number of ELL students who score 41% or more by 20%.

Monitoring:

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

The PSLT will review students progress monitoring data from statewide assessments, iReady diagnostics, and Rtl intervention assessments on a continuous basis and make data-informed targeted instruction in all tiers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marsha Lewis (marsha.lewis@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

MTSS Rti and ESOL instruction. Our Rtl and ESOL specialists will collaborate, and on a scheduled, consistent basis, push-in classrooms, or pull students from classrooms to provide targeted instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Smaller group instruction affords more targeted instruction that focuses on the specific needs of the students in smaller settings versus larger whole-group classrooms.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase the number of SWDs scoring 41% or more on statewide exams.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the number of SWDs scoring 41% or more on statewide exams by 20% by the end of PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The ESE department will collaborate with classroom teachers, the reading interventionists, and administration to consistently monitor, review, update, and utilize data-driven instruction to improve student learning and achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marsha Lewis (marsha.lewis@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ESE Tiers II and III supports.

Tier I instructional accommodations

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students spend most of their day in their classrooms - tier I instruction. Hence it is imperative that tier I instruction includes effective and reasonable accommodations to students. Tiers II and III supports help with providing targeted, data informed instruction to students in a smaller group or one-on-one setting.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase the number of White students scoring 41% or more on statewide assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the number of White students scoring 41% or more by 20%.

Monitoring:

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

The school's PSLT will review students' data regularly, including data from the statewide exams, iReady, and classwork.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marsha Lewis (marsha.lewis@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Targeted, culturally responsive, and individualized instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy will target students specific needs utilizing cultural resources to which students can relate.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Reduce the number of students who receive one or more out-of-school suspensions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce the number of students who receive one or more out of school suspensions by 30%.

Monitoring:

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

We will review behavior data on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Oguz Tekin (oguz.tekin@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

MTSS - PBIS

Restorative justice practices

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An MTSS approach involves the whole school as a community and requires participation from all staff and students. It promotes positive approaches to school discipline and utilizes surgical approaches to improve student conduct such as the check-in check-out system.

Restorative justice practices promotes dialogue, collaboration, and accountability by having students reflect, share, listen to each other, find solutions to their disagreements with the guidance of a teacher or mentor.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

The PSLT will review school data weekly, monthly, quarterly as needed, then make decisions for allocations based on areas of needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Students in K-2 who are scoring below Level 3 will receive After-school tutoring, Weekend classes, and tiers II and III supports in addition to their tier I instruction.

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

Students in grades 3-5 who are scoring below Level 3 will receive After-school tutoring, Weekend classes, and tiers II and III supports in addition to their tier I instruction.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Increase the number of K-2 students performing in the 40th percentile in the FAST PM3 ELA exam from 40% to 51%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase the number of 3-5 students scoring level 3 and above in the FAST PM3 ELA exam from 29% to 51%

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

We will regular review students' progress monitoring data from STAR, FAST, i-Ready, Easy CBM, Into Reading, and STEM Scopes, discuss students' progress with teachers individually as well as in their respective teams/departments. We'll also require teachers to review and discuss students' progress in their teams, plan intervention instruction, and send meeting notes to admin. Instructional coaches and interventionists will implement tiers II and III interventions on a scheduled, consistent basis.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lewis, Marsha, marsha.lewis@charter.hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

MTSS - Response to Intervention

Easy BM Progress Monitoring

Into Reading K-5 Curriculum

Into Literature 6-8 Curriculum

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

MTSS-Rtl and Easy CBM progress monitoring are both research driven approaches/programs that have proven to be effective when aiming to provide tiered instructional supports and interventions for students with specific learning needs/goals.

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 |
|---|---|
| Professional Learning - We've partnered with HMH Professional Development Team who have provided in-person professional development workshop for our teachers. Our partnership also includes additional coaching sessions that will be strategically scheduled throughout the school year to empower teachers to effectively navigate and utilize the curriculum. | Lewis, Marsha, marsha.lewis@charter.hcps.net |
| Assessment - To know where our students are at, we will implement diagnostic assessments, and progress monitoring assessments in a timely manner that will allow for timely data review that will in turn inform instruction. | Tekin, Oguz, oguz.tekin@charter.hcps.net |
| Literacy Coaching - Teachers will be supported through coaching. They will be empowered to utilize a variety of effective instructional strategies. | Lewis, Marsha, marsha.lewis@charter.hcps.net |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The items will be disseminated via electronic mail using Parent Link. They will also be available on the school's website newspringsschools.org

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will continue its annual events such as our Orientation Day, Fall Welcome Picnic, Hispanic Heritage Celebration, Great American Teach-in, Winter Talent Show, Black History Celebration, and International Night to engage families in extra-curricular ways. We will also implement the whole school use of Class Dojo for quick, easy, and convenient communication with families. We will also have Parent Workshops for specific groups such as ELLs, SWDs, students at risk of failing - students receiving Rtl, Algebra students, 3rd grade students, and so on. Finally, we will continue quarterly parent teacher conferences.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We will implement our Tier II and Tier III intervention program before the 10th day of school. We've also designated a 20-30 minute period for daily reading, increasing the use of MyOn and AR. Building momentum by having school-wide Battle of the Books competitions. This in addition to instructional coaching, consistent data reviews, discussion, and collaboration among teams/departments.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Extra curricular activities will be planned keeping in mind families work schedules and socio-economic status. Programs like After school tutoring will be free of cost to families, and students will receive free snacks, breakfast, and lunch.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school has a qualified social worker who will be the designated employee responsible for helping students to navigate mental health challenges. In addition, we aim to maintain a staff of 90% or more who are certified in YMHFA.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We utilize MTSS - PBIS in our school. We also implemented Morning Meetings/Character Education in our school schedule once per week. Students earn rewards such as Eagle bucks, dress day, Dojo points and monthly Fundays.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers received PD from: Kagan Cooperative Learning, Into Reading STEM Scopes, Conscious Classroom Management, Instructional Technology, i-Ready and others on a consistent basis.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Pre-school children are invited to our Summer school to help orient them to our school culture before school actually begins.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----|---------------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | | | | \$100,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | Targeted ESOL Instruction | Personnel | 6657 - New Springs Schools | School Improvement Funds | | \$40,000.00 |
| | Literacy Coaching | Teacher Empowerment | 6657 - New Springs Schools | Other | | \$60,000.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$50,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | ESE Supports | Personnel | 6657 - New Springs Schools | General Fund | | \$50,000.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: White | | | | \$39,000.00 |

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 | |
|----------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| | Progress Monitoring - i-Ready | Individualized Learning | 6657 - New Springs Schools | Title, I Part A | | \$27,000.00 | |
| | Professional Development | Instructional Effectiveness | 6657 - New Springs Schools | Other | | \$12,000.00 | |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | | | | | \$6,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 | |
| | Parental Engagement | Relationships | 6657 - New Springs Schools | Title, I Part A | | \$4,000.00 | |
| | Student Rewards | Positive reinforcement | 6657 - New Springs Schools | Title, I Part A | | \$2,000.00 | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$195,000.00 | |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes