
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Spring Creek Charter School

44440 SPRING CREEK RD, Paisley, FL 32767

<https://sce.lake.k12.fl.us>

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 Spring Creek Charter School is to provide a solid academic foundation through a collaborative environment which instills cooperation, assertiveness, responsibility, empathy, and self-control. We strive to inspire, within our school family, a love of learning that empowers our students to achieve their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We Believe:

- Every child has the potential to learn.
- Each person is valuable.
- We can make a difference.

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
Locke, Wesley	Principal	Facilitate, Maintain and monitor all aspects of fiscal and academic business as it pertains to Spring Creek Charter School.
O'Neal, Kim	Assistant Principal	Support and assist the Principal to facilitate, maintain and monitor all aspects of fiscal and academic business as it pertains to Spring Creek Charter School.
Ferrie, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Support and assist the Principal to facilitate, maintain and monitor all aspects of fiscal and academic business as it pertains to Spring Creek Charter School.
Odom, April	Reading Coach	Facilitate, maintain, oversee, and support staff professional development and student achievement with an emphasis on coaching ELA and Social Studies content areas.
Warensford, Anita	Math Coach	Facilitate, maintain, oversee and support staff professional development and student achievement with an emphasis on coaching mathematics and science content areas.
Watson, Melinda	School Counselor	Facilitate, maintain, and oversee the social, emotional, mental health and well being of students and staff at Spring Creek Charter School.
Wiehe, Rebecca	Other	MTSS and Testing oversight; facilitation and monitoring
Morales, Jessica	Staffing Specialist	ESE School Specialist: facilitate, maintain and oversee all aspects of the Exceptional Student Education Program

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.

Our SIP is developed with input from school staff, parents, Charter Board members, community supporters, and administration. Parents are surveyed at the beginning and end of each school year and asked for their input. Charter Board members are surveyed at our annual meeting in July of each year and asked for their input. As a Title 1 school, we send an annual Title 1 needs assessment and survey to all stakeholders asking for their input concerning our SIP.

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 leadership will be reviewing progress monitoring data each quarter, specifically tracking our Students with Disabilities category. This subgroup is the only subgroup performing below expectations, and with the largest achievement gap. This year's SIP will be adjusted to target our Students with Disabilities subgroup.

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 PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	19%
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	45	36	42	30	39	32	17	14	8	263
One or more suspensions	9	10	9	10	11	10	11	8	4	82
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	16	12	6	5	4	5	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	9	4	4	3	4	7	3	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	30	20	9	11	9	99
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	37	24	6	8	11	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	20	23	33	47	27	17	14	7	201

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	13	20	23	33	47	27	17	14	7	201

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	13	7	2	14	4	5	0	0	0	45
Students retained two or more times	0	4	9	14	8	10	4	1	2	52

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	28	69	60	45	55	42	46	30	15	390
One or more suspensions	5	12	3	9	3	22	7	6	17	84
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	2	1	1	3	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	2	1	1	2	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	20	21	7	4	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	23	16	6	3	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	18	12	23	19	23	31	13	5	146

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	2	18	12	23	19	23	31	13	5	146

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	4	2	1	0	1	0	1	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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 days	28	69	60	45	55	42	46	30	15	390
One or more suspensions	5	12	3	9	3	22	7	6	17	84
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	2	1	1	3	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	2	1	1	2	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	20	21	7	4	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	23	16	6	3	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	18	12	23	19	23	31	13	5	146

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	2	18	12	23	19	23	31	13	5	146

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	4	2	1	0	1	0	1	13
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*	43	62	53	46	64	55	43		
ELA Learning Gains				51			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			28		
Math Achievement*	46	68	55	47	44	42	46		
Math Learning Gains				60			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			45		
Science Achievement*	47	61	52	44	65	54	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	84	68	81	66	59	66		
Middle School Acceleration	64	73	70	40	54	51	65		
Graduation Rate		63	74		58	50			
College and Career Acceleration		35	53		82	70			
ELP Progress	64	59	55	70	64	70			

* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
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	25	Yes	4	2
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	46			
MUL	27	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	53			

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	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	56			

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				
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	52			

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	43			46			47	56	64			64
SWD	17			23			30				4	
ELL											1	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	43			45			33				4	64
MUL	27			27							2	
PAC												
WHT	44			47			51	57	65		6	
FRL	38			42			44	56	69		7	70

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	46	51	51	47	60	45	44	81	40			70
SWD	17	35	37	19	47	40	8					
ELL	56	53		38	47							70
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												
HSP	56	52		46	55							70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45	51	48	48	61	45	44	81	39			
FRL	43	52	46	43	60	46	38	88				

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	43	45	28	46	53	45	52	66	65			
SWD	15	26	21	14	47	48	9					
ELL	19	31		43	75							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	41	48		38	64		40					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45	47	31	48	53	43	54	67	64			
FRL	40	42	23	38	52	43	44	67	44			

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	32%	52%	-20%	54%	-22%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	43%	6%	47%	2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	46%	4%	47%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	54%	-13%	58%	-17%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	46%	-4%	47%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	50%	7%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	54%	9%
07	2023 - Spring	22%	47%	-25%	48%	-26%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	62%	-6%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	59%	-22%	61%	-24%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	44%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	51%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	51%	31%	50%	32%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	67%	-11%	66%	-10%

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 lowest data component for the 22-23 school was ELA at 45.16% proficiency for grades K-8. Our goal last year was to make at least 55% proficiency K-8 which was not met. We dropped from the previous year 21-22 by 1.4% proficiency. Contributing factors include: implementation of 2 new rigorous curriculums, lack of ample planning time, training needs to implement new curriculum, and lack of consistency of qualified teacher in the classroom (hiring), and increase in students with disabilities. Another low data component for the 22-23 school year noted is our subgroup of students with disabilities. Over the period of 3 consecutive years the subgroup of students with disabilities was below 41% proficiency and for 1 year has been below 32% proficiency. When analyzing and indicating that ELA dropped in proficiency we are also noting the drop in proficiency of students with disabilities and are beginning to create a goal around proficiency specifically for students with disabilities in our area of focus for academics. The contributing factor for this low performing area in students with disabilities ties closely to the drop in proficiency in ELA with the whole population, because literacy is crucial to be proficient in all subjects.

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

Last year the greatest proficiency decline was 7th grade Civics which went from 81% proficiency in the 21-22 school year to 56% proficient in the 22-23 school year. Contributing factors were increased number of students with disabilities and 51% of those 7th graders are not reading on grade level. Civics is also a very content rich vocabulary course, in which comprehension is needed to understand the course content.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average looking at K-8 data is mathematics. The gap in proficiency was 6.5%. In previous years the gap was larger, but now we are showing improvement in the gap with new curriculum and quality teacher recruitment.

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

The most improved component was mathematics. We did not meet our previous goal to increase mathematics to 55% proficient. However, we improved our proficiency from 46.7% to 53.49% increasing our overall proficiency by 6.79%. New actions taken in the 22-23 school year were: high qualified teachers in math, new curriculum implementation accompanied by in person training throughout the school year. We also accompanied tier 1 instruction implementing the computer program Zearn. Coaching cycles were also offered.

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

Reflecting on EWS data two potential areas of concern are: attendance rates and disciplinary data. Last year, Spring Creek has 1,040 referrals that needed administration intervention compared to the previous year which was 830 referrals.

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

- 1) Discipline Referrals
- 2) Attendance

- 3) ELA Proficiency
- 4) Students with disabilities

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 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.

After the team reviewed the data, the lowest performing subgroup was students with disabilities. The students with disabilities subgroup population has increased 3% in 22-23 from the previous 21-22 school year. The students with disabilities population in the 22-23 school year was 20.95% of the school population consisting of 128 students with individualized education plans. The team has also noticed an increase in MTSS tier 2 and 3 supports.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 22-23 school year, students with disabilities subgroup population had 29% proficient. This means 37 students with disabilities out of 128 students were proficient within the subgroup. Spring Creek Charter School's goal is to improve our proficiency rate in ELA for the subgroup of students with disabilities from 29% to 41% by increasing proficiency by 16 students and maintain 37 students at proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Spring Creek Charter school will analyze data via iReady benchmark and Progress Monitoring assessments for the subgroup of students with disabilities to determine students who are at level 1 and level 2. We will monitor data monthly on these students to determine needs and data to drive instruction in Reading intervention and acceleration time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wesley Locke (lockew@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

The interventions implemented for the subgroup of students with disabilities are: iReady instruction K-8, Achieve 3000 6-8, Foundations K-3, Being a Reader 3-5, and support facilitation if included on student's IEP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Spring Creek Charter is looking to increase adequate progress/growth among our population of students with disabilities. We have recently purchased Foundations and iReady to support teachers.

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.

Monitoring the data monthly for students with disability using iReady and Progress Monitoring assessment data.

Person Responsible: Wesley Locke (lockew@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly for the entire 23-24 school year

Data tracking in the classroom and data driven instruction using the curriculum for support to fill gaps in reading using Foundations, Achieve 3000, and Being a Reader.

Person Responsible: April Odom (odoma@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly for the entire school year 23-24

#2. 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.

One area of focus for improvement after analyzing student information system data and EWS data is the number of discipline referrals at Spring Creek is steadily increasing. In the 22-23 school year, Spring had a total of 1,040 discipline referrals that needed administration intervention. When reviewing K-8 discipline data 82 students received 1 or more suspensions. Out of the 82 students receiving 1 or more suspensions the subgroup of students with disabilities was noted as having 22 students with disabilities had 1 or more suspensions. 27% of students who received 1 or more suspensions were identified as students with a disability.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Spring Creek Charter's measurable outcome for the 23-24 school year is to decrease the number of discipline referrals by 10%. Therefore, our plan is drop the number of referrals by 100. We plan to use Responsive Classroom Learning Environment and Responding to Misbehavior strategies (counseling session data) and monitor through classroom incident trackers, discipline referrals, and discipline reporting through the Focus information system.

Monitoring:

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

Spring Creek Charter will analyze and problem solve discipline data monthly at leadership meetings. We will then create action plans to discuss at faculty meetings and grade-level data meetings. The sources of data that will be analyzed will include: Focus discipline and SESIR reports, BTA reports, incident trackers, counseling data. Action plans created for students who are struggling with behavior will monitored through various ways including: parent conferences, student conferences, counseling sessions (group and/or individual), Problem Solving Team Meetings, MTSS plans for behavior, etc... in order to find behavioral strategies that work for students that have multiple incidents/referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim O'Neal (onealm@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

The evidenced based intervention being implemented campus-wide for this area of focus is Responsive Classroom. Spring Creek is also continuing the use of small group and individual counseling sessions, problems solving meetings, and behavior MTSS interventions. If we implement Responsive Classroom practices for responding to misbehaviors we will be able to implement behavioral interventions that will support students with multiple discipline referrals/incidents and will be able to decrease by referrals by 10% or more for the 23-24 school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Responsive Classroom is a research based approach that creates a positive community focusing on cooperation, assertion, responsibility, empathy, and self-control. Responsive Classroom also uses problem solving conferences and positive time-out.

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.

Training in Responsive Classroom

Person Responsible: Kim O'Neal (onealm@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: The summer of 2023 and ongoing for new hires. Dates of training were July 31st-August 2023. Bus drivers trained on August 2, 2023. Substitute teachers were trained on July 27th, 2023.

Monthly tracking of discipline data and reviewing information to problem solve with staff solutions for behaviors.

Person Responsible: Melinda Watson (watsonm@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly beginning in September 2023

Collection of data prior to the end of each month to prepare for leadership to review and focus on action plans at the first meeting of the month, followed by faculty meeting for action plans.

Person Responsible: Melinda Watson (watsonm@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly beginning in September 2023

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 process used to review school improvement funding allocations to ensure resources are allocated based on needs involves: the leadership team and charter governing board analyze data from the prior year to see what needs will be addressed, teacher surveys for input, creation of goals and action plans to implement resources for improvement. Financial meetings are also held with the school's accountant and bookkeeping department.

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.

<https://sce.lake.k12.fl.us/our-school/title-1/title-1-documents>

Annual Title One Meeting

All plans will be posted on website.

Charter Board (acting SAC) discussion during scheduled Charter Board meeting

All meetings are advertised by website, announcements to staff, FB (SCCS, SCCS Staff, SCCS PTO), newspaper and One Call as feasible

Parents provided with opportunity to request a printed copy of the SIP by either calling the school, sending a not

to the child's teacher or requesting one in person at the front office.

Links to the SIP distributed through the same means as the Charter Board meeting announcements

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))

<https://sce.lake.k12.fl.us/our-school/title-1/title-1-documents>

Spring Creek Charter School builds positive relationships through continuous communication (teacher or staff contacts, class mass communications, OneCall, website, local newspaper, etc), PTO, Charter Board meetings, and family or community events sponsored by the school with or without the collaboration of other agencies.

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)

Professional development opportunities for teachers and staff to increase effective implementation on foundational/core curriculum

Intervention and Acceleration blocks in master schedule for both ELA and Math

Implementing the use of iReady for benchmark assessments for data driven instruction

Quarterly data discussions with Leadership Team and grade level personnel

Parent conferences including mandatory parent contact quarterly for students who are not meeting promotional requirements

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))

Work in collaboration with Title 3 to identify and support ELL students

After school tutoring for homeless students

Work in collaboration with Title One Part C to identify and support migrant students

Provide additional teacher contact hours for the Title One VPK unit

School counselors provide Mental Health Nights

In collaboration with the Lake County Sheriff's Office 5th Grade receives DARE instruction from the 2023 Florida SRD of the Year

Culinary Arts program and FFA in middle school support career and tech learning