

The School District of Lee County

Spring Creek Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	13
III. Planning for Improvement	18
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	34
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	34
VI. Title I Requirements	38
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	41

Spring Creek Elementary School

25571 ELEMENTARY WAY, Bonita Springs, FL 34135

<http://spc.leeschools.net/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

Spring Creek's purpose is to collaboratively achieve personal and academic excellence in an engaging, safe, and trusting environment of shared leadership.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spring Creek's vision is to be a world class school.

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
Faber, Chelsey	Reading Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support and train teachers in differentiated instruction in grades K-2 - Support teachers by administering supplemental materials for reading intervention - Attend and support Teachers during PLC meetings - Collect school-wide data for quarterly discussions - Develop and collaborate with teachers on progress monitoring - Teach small groups during intervention
Tubbs, Stephanie	Reading Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support and train teachers in differentiated instruction in grades 3-5 - Support teachers by administering supplemental materials for reading intervention - Attend and support Teachers during PLC meetings - Collect school-wide data for quarterly discussions - Develop and collaborate with teachers on progress monitoring - Teach small groups during intervention
Somers, Stefany	Math Coach	<p>Support and train teachers in differentiated instruction in math in grades K-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support teachers by administering supplemental materials for math intervention - Attend and support Teachers during PLC meetings - Collect school-wide data for quarterly discussions - Develop and collaborate with teachers on progress monitoring
Fiora, Jillian	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build and support a learning organization focused on student success. - Engage in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement and communicate the relationship among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance. - Implement professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction, provides resources and times, and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year. - Develop sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, the community, higher education and business leaders. - Manage schedules, delegate, and allocate resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development and demonstrate a fiscal responsibility to maximize the the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities. - Attend Team, PLC, Faculty, and monthly professional development meetings - Conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide timely feedback on the effectiveness of instruction.
Morrisroe, Rose	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a paraprofessional support schedule - Facilitate a student climate that supports student engagement in learning by implementing PBIS within the school. - Engage in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement by assisting with the implementation of the district's curricula and state's

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		academic standards in a manner that is culturally relevant to the students and school, and ensure that the appropriate use of formative and state mandated assessments. This will include PLC, Team, and faculty meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide timely feedback on the effectiveness of instruction. - Assist with professional development - Assist and monitor APPLE teachers
Gaudioso, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teachers are responsible for implementing the state mandated assessments and creating lessons that are differentiated to meet the needs of all leveled learners. Support and deliver small group lessons for students that are monitored through MTSS and attend meetings to discuss and adjust their needs based on their performance
Juarez, Stephanie	Science Coach	Support and train teachers in grades 3-5 on Math and Science. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support teachers by administering supplemental materials for math intervention - Attend and support Teachers during PLC meetings - Collect school-wide data for quarterly discussions - Develop and collaborate with teachers on progress monitoring
Izaguirre, Leeann	Parent Engagement Liaison	Maintain contact with parents to assure continued success for each student. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assist teachers in communicating concerns to parents. - maintain records of parent involvement
Bonilla, Diana	ELL Compliance Specialist	Assure that all English Language Learners are receiving services as mandated by the state. Duties include, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - initiate and maintain ESOL documentation and records. - Evaluate students for placement and eligibility. - Monitor ESOL records - Schedule and conduct ELL meetings and retention meetings.

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.

Spring Creek Elementary's stakeholders collaborate to effectively deliver and monitor the needs of our students to help them become successful. In doing so, we each have a role that is supportive in building relationships with students that encourages them to develop a growth mindset.

The Principal's role is to Build and support a learning organization focused on student success.

- Engage in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement and communicate the relationship

among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance.

- Implement professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction, provides resources and times, and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.
- Develop sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, the community, higher education and business leaders.
- Manage schedules, delegate, and allocate resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development and demonstrate a fiscal responsibility to maximize the the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.
- Attend Team, PLC, Faculty, and monthly professional development meetings
- Conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide timely feedback on the effectiveness of instruction.

The Assistant Principal's role is to create a paraprofessional support schedule.

- Facilitate a student climate that supports student engagement in learning by implementing PBIS within the school.
- Engage in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement by assisting with the implementation of the district's curricula and state's academic standards in a manner that is culturally relevant to the students and school, and ensure that the appropriate use of formative and state mandated assessments. This will include PLC, Team, and faculty meetings.
- conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide timely feedback on the effectiveness of instruction.
- Assist with professional development
- Assist and monitor APPLE teachers

We have reading (Chelsey Faber, Stephanie Tubbs) and math (Stefanie Somers and Stephanie Juarez) coaches, two for K-2 and two for 3-5. Their roles are to establish relationships with teachers and support them with differentiated instruction materials to be used during core instruction. They also assist with intervention groups, and attend PLC meetings to discuss progress monitoring results. Support and train teachers in differentiated instruction.

Our Intervention Specialist, Ashley Laine facilitates the implementation of the MTSS problem solving process in the building. She schedules and attends meeting and maintains a log of all students that are part of the MTSS process. She meets with teachers to aid in support for Tier 2 & 3 students.

Our ELL Compliance Specialist teacher is Diana Bonilla. Students that fall into the LY < 2 of English proficiency are monitored using Imagine Learning, to aid in developing basic English Language skills.

Classroom teachers are responsible for implementing the state mandated assessments and creating lessons that are differentiated to meet the needs of all leveled learners. Support and deliver small group lessons for students that are monitored through MTSS and attend meetings to discuss and adjust their needs based on their performance.

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))

Spring Creek Elementary will effectively monitor students' progress by implementing the curriculum that is standard based and taught using best practice strategies such as, Whole Brain Teaching, KAGAN, SIOp and using a Growth Mindset, that all staff had and will be been trained on. We will ensure that students' that are below the proficiency requirements are developing their fluency daily. We will keep records of performance and celebrate all students' achievements and improvements. We will create and apply strategic intervention lessons to increase reading performance and develop comprehension skills.

Administration will conduct walkthroughs with feedback to support teachers in providing effective and highly effective learning within the classroom. Professional development trainings will be offered to teachers that will help increase the rigor of implementing the standards. The assistant principal will monitor the APPLES program for new teachers that will ensure students' success. Our administration and leadership team will implement ongoing support during PLCs that will be conducted weekly, where we will review data that will guide us in supporting students who are not meeting proficiency. The data that will be discussed, will be based off of STAR, STAR Early Lit, i-Ready, DIBELS, and Exemplars.

Reading and math coaches will assist teachers with materials that will aid them during core reading and math differentiated instruction and work with small groups during intervention. They will provide standard based resources that will support teachers in the classroom. Coaches will attend PLCs for discussion on students performing below the required proficiency level and offer strategies and support for students in need.

The intervention specialist will monitor students that are on or need to be placed on the Tier 2 and Tier 3 leveled academic/behavioral support. She will work with teachers, parents and stakeholders in creating individualized plans for extra support within the classroom. She will assist teachers in monitoring and recording their progress and create meeting when necessary to adjust plans that are in place.

The ELL compliance specialist will monitor students that are LY<2 on Imagine Learning and Rosetta Stone programs. She will monitor their progress and send reports to teachers of their progress.

Paraprofessionals will assist teachers during reading and math for small group instruction guided by the teacher.

Teachers will utilize and monitor programs such as formative assessments, i-Ready, Really Great Reading, and Imagine Learning and determine their student's level of instruction needed. Teachers will attend PLC meetings to discuss achievement levels and strategies for improvement for each student. Students will have data folders to graph their performance that will be reviewed and discussed with their teacher and made accessible for parents to view. Teachers will conduct regular communication with parents on their child's progress and/or concerns using daily planners, scheduled conferences, and or phone calls.

Spring Creek will implement a tutoring program that delivers strategic instruction to students that are performing below the required percentile for academic achievement.

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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification	ATSI

*updated as of 3/11/2024	
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	0	13	11	11	11	14	14	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	4	1	7	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	13	13	29	15	11	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	12	6	3	6	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	22	26	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	10	21	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	6	0	32	24	12	16	0	106

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	3	3	19	18	20	0	0	63

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	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	4

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	13	11	11	11	14	14	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	4	1	7	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	13	13	29	15	11	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	12	6	3	6	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	22	26	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	10	21	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	6	32	24	12	16	0	0	0	106

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	3	3	19	18	20	0	0	0	63

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	4

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	13	11	11	11	14	14	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	4	1	7	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	13	13	29	15	11	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	12	6	3	6	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	22	26	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	10	21	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	6	32	24	12	16	0	0	0	106

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	3	3	19	18	20	0	0	0	63

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	4

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*	42	48	53	49	52	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				53			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			59		
Math Achievement*	53	57	59	64	45	50	67		
Math Learning Gains				61			76		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			63		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	53	53	54	48	59	59	56		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	42	51	59	51			48		

* 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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	220
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	49			

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	42			53			53					42
SWD	18			30			23				5	37
ELL	27			37			33				5	42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	37			51			50				5	43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69			67			62				4	
FRL	39			50			45				5	42

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	49	53	41	64	61	38	48					51
SWD	26	34	33	39	52	33	30					35
ELL	32	51	36	49	55	34	40					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	44	53	41	61	59	38	42					51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73	56		83	77		88					
FRL	46	49	41	63	62	36	45					50

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	50	59	59	67	76	63	56					48
SWD	29	38	45	50	67	58	50					35
ELL	32	60	57	56	71	73	42					48

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	56	58	64	77	64	52					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	77		85	69		77					
FRL	47	55	47	63	69	56	52					42

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	51%	48%	3%	54%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	56%	1%	58%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	29%	42%	-13%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	55%	-5%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	51%	-1%

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.

ELA proficiency decreased by 4 percentage points from FY22 to FY23. Math proficiency decreased by 8 percentage points. There is one subgroup below 41%, which is the Students with Disabilities subgroup. This subgroup was at 35% in FY22 and 6 percentage points away from our goal for this year. FY21 this subgroup scored at 47% which is a 12 percentage point difference within a year. The contributing factors were the loss of instruction due to Hurricane Ian. We lost one month of instructional time and many students were displaced as a result. Additionally, the BEST benchmarks were new to the teachers in FY22 and the benchmarks are extensive requiring professional development in how to address and master said benchmarks. SCE comprises of 82% Hispanic students making a total of 486 student and of those students, 290 are LY making up 83% of our students speaking another language. Third grade overall scored 28% with an ELA teacher preparing to leave the district. Due to teacher shortages and attendance struggles, Resource teachers assisted with covering classes. Instructional support/Paraprofessionals was limited due to the SPALC shortages. Regarding Students with Disabilities subgroup, attendance was an issue as many of our ESE students were required to go to specific specialists outside of school-based special services (doctor appointments).

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

ELA proficiency decreased by 4 percentage points from FY22 to FY23. When specifically looking at grade levels, Third grade ELA decreased 19 percentage points from FY22 to FY23. Contributing factors include that this grade level is the virtual learning Covid cohort. Additionally, the loss of instruction due to Hurricane Ian. We lost one month of instructional time and many students were displaced. SCE comprises of 82% Hispanic students making a total of 486 student and of those students, 290 are LY making up 83% of our students speaking another language. Additionally, the BEST benchmarks were new to the teachers in FY22 and the benchmarks are extensive requiring professional development in how to address and master said benchmarks. Third grade overall scored 28% with an ELA teacher preparing to leave the district. Due to teacher shortages and attendance struggles, Resource teachers assisted with covering classes. Instructional support/Paraprofessionals was limited due to the SPALC shortages diminishing smaller intentional interventions.

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.

When looking at State data the greatest gap would be the math L25 learning gains. FY22 math L25 learning gain percentage was 38%. As compared to the state, this was 9 percentage points below (state 47%). All other areas were higher except ELA proficiency which was two points below at 49%. The contributing factors include the loss of instruction due to Hurricane Ian. We lost one month of instructional time and many students were displaced as a result. Additionally, the BEST benchmarks were new to teachers in FY22 and the benchmarks are extensive requiring professional development in how to address and master said benchmarks. SCE comprises of 82% Hispanic students making a total of 486 student and of those students, 290 are LY making up 83% of our students speaking another language. Third grade overall scored 28% with an ELA teacher preparing to leave the district. Due to teacher shortages and attendance struggles, Resource teachers assisted with covering classes. Instructional support/Paraprofessionals was limited due to the SPALC shortages.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was Science proficiency. FY22 Science proficiency was at 48%. Now, FY23, Science proficiency is at 52%. The new action we took for this percentage increase was providing a tighter schedule for the Science Coach to push-in during class and teaching Science/STEM to the 5th grade students. Additionally, the Science Coach and Administration focused on academic vocabulary being a priority to enhance reading/understanding/literacy.

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

The potential area of concern is the number of substantial below readers in third (32) and fourth grade (24). Along with this is the number of students who scored a level 1 on the ELA state assessment. In third grade, 37 out of 74 students (50%) rank at 30 percentile or below according to FY23 ELA state results (these will now be our fourth-graders). In fourth grade, 45 out of 100 students (45%) scored at a level 1 according to FY23 ELA state results.

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

- 1.) Third Grade ELA proficiency FY18 - 49%/ FY19 - 43%/ FY21 - 54%/ FY22 - 47%/ FY23 - 28% (horizontal alignment) For vertical alignment FY22 40% to 47% - FY23 25% to 28% (only 3% increase)
- 2.) Fourth Grade ELA proficiency FY23 - 28% (vertical alignment)
- 3.) Overall Math proficiency FY22 - 64% FY23 - 56% Looking at prior year potential by grade:
FY22 - PY - End of Year
3rd 43% - 67%
4th 64% - 58%
5th 61% - 59%

FY23 - PY - End of Year
3rd 22% - 51%
4th 77% - 66%
5th 64% - 52%
- 4.) ELA and Math L25 Learning Gains
FY22 - ELA L25% = 41% above district (36%) and state (40%)
Math L25% = 38% below district (43%) and state (47%)
- 5.) ESE Subgroup FY21 47%/ FY22 35%

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

As the country faces a national teacher and struggles with teacher retention, SCE has experienced the same struggles with teacher retention. For 23-24 school year, we had to hire 9 positions ranging in all grades.

Research shows that the most influential variable to student achievement is teacher longevity/teacher experience.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome we will adopt are teacher incentives and an enhanced model of teacher input. For teacher incentives:

We will provide bi-weekly/monthly Happy Cart. The Happy Cart will gift teachers beverages and small snacks.

Weekly, we will have Teacher of the Week where the teacher parks in a coveted parking spot and possibly a donated gift card.

Monthly, the Principal will chair "Coffee with Principal" to provide an inviting environment while enjoying coffee.

After walk throughs, or witnessing something to celebrate, administration will give positive "Glow" notes with a suggestion to help teacher's grow.

Administration will have an open door policy for all staff members to listen and when collaborate on solutions.

Teacher Input:

Administration is adhering to High Reliability Schools Model and providing teacher input via an anonymous survey that is emailed daily to all staff.

Teachers will provide input to Administration during Faculty Meetings, Committee Meetings, PLC, Leadership Meetings, and Grade Level Chair Meetings.

Admin will have an open door policy providing teacher input.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored via:

Calendar invites to all staff regarding incentives listed above, climate surveys, monitoring the teacher suggestion survey and providing a response weekly, sign in sheets/agendas to Committee meetings and Coffee with Principal.

Glow notes will be tracked via a walk-through schedule.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jillian Fiora (jillianf@leeschools.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.)

High Reliability Schools (HRS) Model: Marzano Model OR APPLES

For the 23-24 school year, SCE will begin the L2 HRS framework:

Schools can communicate a clear vision for effective instruction.

Explore ways in which a school can support teachers through reflection and professional growth plans.

Learn how a school can gain awareness of and monitor predominant instructional practices.

Examine strategies for providing teachers with ongoing evaluations of their strengths and weaknesses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a district we are implementing the HRS Model. For 23-24 SCE will begin Level 2 with a focus on best instructional practices. "High-quality instruction is the most important tool educators have at their disposal to positively affect student learning. Develop and maintain teacher effectiveness in every classroom by building a shared language of instruction and using this common language to raise the level of pedagogical skill both individually and collectively. Teachers will feel empowered and appreciated, thus increasing teacher retention.

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.

Weekly, the Administration will pick a Teacher of the Week to celebrate.

Person Responsible: Rose Morrisroe (rosemo@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Daily, the Secretary will send out an email with a Link to a Staff reflection/suggestions google form survey. Administration will monitor this survey weekly and respond accordingly to provide an open forum for teachers to voice school-based suggestions and opportunities.

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianlf@leeschools.net)

By When: A weekly response.

A Happy Cart will be celebrated to teachers by way of enhancing the school culture.

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianlf@leeschools.net)

By When: Bi-Weekly/Monthly

#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.

Students with Disabilities was identified as our ATSI subgroup. In FY21, this subgroup was at 47%. In FY22, this subgroup decreased by 12 percentage points and is now at 35%. If we analyzed this group by school grade components, this subgroup is below 41% in all components except for math learning gains which was at 52%. This group's lowest component was ELA proficiency at 26%. As a result, we will focus on Attendance and Behaviors that may disrupt this subgroups success in all arenas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will increase from 35% to 41% overall according to state assessment results.

Monitoring:

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

Bi-Weekly attendance reports
Survey R

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jillian Fiora (jillianf@leeschools.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.)

- Bi-weekly the Attendance Committee will review the attendance of ESE students to gauge.
 - If a student is chronically absent, the Social Worker will create a contract with the students and discuss the importance of being in school.
 - If a student exhibits behavioral concerns, the Assistant Principal will provide Restorative Practice and work with the ESE teacher, School Counselor and Social Worker to create a plan.
- For Teacher Strategy students will be placed according to their IEP and teachers will build positive relationship with all students.
- The Master Schedule will ensure explicit scheduling strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Since the Student with Disabilities subgroup is our ATSI subgroup it is important to target this group. Since this group is about 20 students, by targeting this small cohort and providing them with consistent intensive attendance and behavior interventions targeting their deficiencies we will be able to move this group out of the ATSI status.

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.

Bi-weekly - monthly the Attendance Team will meet with a focus on the ESE population to gauge each students Tier.

For Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, the Social Worker will follow the Truancy Procedures as per district policy.

Person Responsible: Rose Morrisroe (rosemo@leeschools.net)

By When: Bi-weekly to Monthly

Monthly, the Assistant Principal will monitor behavior by completing the Survey R report to gauge student referrals for this subgroup. The AP will work with the School Counselor, Social Worker and ESE teacher to provide restorative practice for Tier 2/Tier 3 students.

The School Counselor/Social Worker will provide small group for this population to create a de-escalation plan (Zones of Regulation).

Person Responsible: Rose Morrisroe (rosemo@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly, as per district protocol, AP will pull the Survey R report to identify Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Administration will ensure that Teacher Strategy is a priority for the ESE subgroup.

The Master Schedule will be tight and intentional when placing students with a teacher who builds a positive rapport.

The Principal, will provide professional development opportunities to the ESE teachers focused on building relationships, Zones of Regulation, as well as best practice initiatives (Teach Like a Champion, Kagan, Whole Brain, High-Yield Strategies

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianlf@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

As measured by the 2022-2023 preliminary FAST assessment results, 56% of our students were proficient in Math. This is an eight percentage point decrease from our FY22 state assessment result. As we look at specific cohort of students, fourth grade had a 11 percentage point decrease from the prior year and fifth grade had a 12 percentage point drop from the prior year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 65% of our students will be proficient in grades 3-5, as measured by the Math portion of the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Lesson Plan
Intervention Results
Math Fluency Reports
District Assessments
FAST Progress Monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

-A systematic, intensive standard-based intervention will be in place for Math. Our academic coach with depth of standard-based knowledge will create intervention packet and make sure all stakeholders are prepared for instruction and are aware of student results.
-A focus on daily math fluency practice will be in place in order for students to meet state fluency standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Since Math proficiency decreased from the prior year, by targeting the deficiencies we will quickly remediate and increase percent proficient. Also by implementing daily fluency practice, students will start to see progress more frequently thus increase their self-efficacy in Math.

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.

Check lesson plans to ensure grade levels/subject areas follow pacing guidelines, the school instructional framework is followed and school initiatives are used consistently.

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianlf@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Create Math intervention packets for grades 3-5 targeting low achieving benchmarks based on data. Make sure to include item specs, question stems, academic vocab, and strategies/best practices to pinpoint benchmark. Create exit ticket for grade level and make sure immediate feedback is given to all students, as well as the results are shared with all stakeholders involved.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Juarez (stephaniemj@leeschools.net)

By When: Bi-weekly - make sure to follow yearly intervention calendar so multiply benchmarks can be targeted before state assessment.

Ensure weekly math fluency differentiated practice sheets are practiced daily and tracked weekly to ensure progress is being made.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Juarez (stephaniemj@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Coaching cycles for under-developed and/or new Math teachers will be determined through our instructional framework checklist. Admin and Math coach will work together using a two-week coaching cycle. Every two weeks, progress will be discussed and plans moving forward will be determined. All documentation will be in a coaching log notebook.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Juarez (stephaniemj@leeschools.net)

By When: Every two weeks

Daily walkthroughs to ensure benchmark alignment.

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianlf@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

As measured by the 2022-2023 preliminary FAST assessment results, 45% of our 3-5 students were proficient in ELA. This is a four percentage point decrease from our FY22 state assessment results. As we look at specific grade levels, third grade had a 19 percentage point decrease (28%) from the prior year third grade proficiency score of 47%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 51% of our students in grades 3-5 will be proficient, as measured by the ELA portion of the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Lesson Plans
District Assessment
Intervention Results
FAST Progress Monitoring Results
DIBELS Scores
Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jillian Fiora (jillianlf@leeschools.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.)

-iReady Phonics program will be implemented with our students who identified as having gaps in phonics. We will partner with the Academic Department at the district to provide trainings and materials for our staff.

-A systematic, intensive standard-based intervention will be in place for ELA. Our academic coach with depth of standard-based knowledge will create intentional intervention packet and make sure all stakeholders are prepared for instruction and are aware of student results.

-Imagine Learning program for LY students who meet the criteria

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Since ELA proficiency decreased from the prior year, by targeting the deficiencies we will quickly remediate and increase percent proficient.

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.

Intervention - The ESOL teacher will track student weekly progress on Imagine Learning program. When vast improvement in student progress is noticed through triangulation of data, student will be transferred to iReady standard-based computer program with ESOL teacher support and tracking for continued progress.

Person Responsible: Diana Bonilla (dianaboni@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - Students will be expected to read a book on their Zone of Proximal Development and answer three weekly questions in their writing notebook (What is the central idea? etc). The teacher will track all students using a reading log.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Intervention - Create ELA intervention packets for 3-5 targeting low achieving benchmarks based on data. Make sure to include item specs, question stems, academic vocab, and strategies/best practices to pinpoint benchmark. Create exit ticket for grade level and make sure immediate feedback is given to all students, as well as the results are shared with all stakeholders involved. The students identified needing the iReady Phonics program will use this program along with targeted standard-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Bi-weekly - make sure to follow yearly intervention calendar so multiply benchmarks can be targeted before state assessment.

Tier 1 - Check lesson plans to ensure grade levels/subject areas follow pacing guidelines, the school instructional framework is followed, and school initiatives are used consistently.

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianlf@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Intervention - Ensure weekly reading fluency differentiated practice sheets are practiced daily and tracked weekly to ensure progress is being made.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Planning - Weekly collaborative lesson planning with reading coach to address the following areas as well as using the backwards design model:

1. Student Accommodations (at the top)
2. Daily Spotlight Benchmark, Supporting Standards, Essential Question
3. Academic Vocabulary
4. Higher Level Questions
5. I-Do, We-Do, You-Do (or beginning, middle, end in order to make a cohesive lesson for the student)
6. Exit Ticket or Reflection Activity
7. Centers and/or Kagan Structure
8. Hook/Previewing

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - Coaching cycles for will be determined through our instructional framework checklist used during walkthroughs. Admin and ELA coach will work together using a two-week coaching cycle. Every two weeks, progress will be discussed and plans moving forward will be determined. All documentation will be in a coaching log notebook.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Every two weeks

Planning - PLC meeting will address the four essential PLC questions.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - PD once or twice per month addressing our needs in regards to our initiatives - Whole Brain, Teach Like a Champion, Kagan, High Yield Strategies

Person Responsible: Rose Morrisroe (rosemo@leeschools.net)

By When: Once or twice per month

Daily Walkthroughs to endure benchmark alignment

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianf@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

Daily Walkthroughs to endure benchmark alignment

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianf@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

As measured by the 2022-2023 preliminary FAST assessment results, 45% of our 3-5 students were proficient in ELA. This is a four percentage point decrease from our FY22 state assessment results. As we look at specific grade levels, third grade had a 19 percentage point decrease (28%) from the prior year third grade proficiency score of 47%. The third-graders made a three percentage increase from their second grade ELA state results (25%). Our third-graders this year are coming into third grade 47% proficient. In the past a seven point increase has been achieved.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 54% of our students in third grade will be proficient as measured by the ELA portion of the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

- Lesson Plans
- District Assessment
- Intervention Results
- FAST Progress Monitoring Results
- DIBELS Scores
- Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

- iReady Phonics program will be implemented with our students who identified as having gaps in phonics. We will partner with the Academic Department at the district to provide trainings and materials for our staff.
- A systematic, intensive standard-based intervention will be in place for ELA. Our academic coach with depth of standard-based knowledge will create intentional intervention packet and make sure all stakeholders are prepared for instruction and are aware of student results.
- Imagine Learning program for LY students who meet the criteria

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Since ELA proficiency decreased from the prior year, by targeting the deficiencies we will quickly remediate and increase percent proficient.

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.

Intervention - The ESOL teacher will track student weekly progress on Imagine Learning program. When vast improvement in student progress is noticed through triangulation of data, student will be transferred to iReady standard-based computer program with ESOL teacher support and tracking for continued progress.

Person Responsible: Diana Bonilla (dianaboni@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - Students will be expected to read a book on their Zone of Proximal Development and answer three weekly questions in their writing notebook (What is the central idea? etc). The teacher will track all students using a reading log.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Intervention - Create ELA intervention packets for third grade targeting low achieving benchmarks based on data. Make sure to include item specs, question stems, academic vocab, and strategies/best practices to pinpoint benchmark. Create exit ticket for grade level and make sure immediate feedback is given to all students, as well as the results are shared with all stakeholders involved. The students identified needing the iReady Phonics program will use this program along with targeted standard-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When:

Tier 1 - Check lesson plans to ensure grade levels/subject areas follow pacing guidelines, the school instructional framework is followed, and school initiatives are used consistently.

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianlf@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Intervention - Ensure weekly reading fluency differentiated practice sheets are practiced daily and tracked weekly to ensure progress is being made.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Planning - Weekly collaborative lesson planning with reading coach to address the following areas as well as using the backwards design model:

1. Student Accommodations (at the top)
2. Daily Spotlight Benchmark, Supporting Standards, Essential Question
3. Academic Vocabulary
4. Higher Level Questions
5. I-Do, We-Do, You-Do (or beginning, middle, end in order to make a cohesive lesson for the student)
6. Exit Ticket or Reflection Activity
7. Centers and/or Kagan Structure
8. Hook/Previewing

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - Coaching cycles for will be determined through our instructional framework checklist used during walkthroughs. Admin and ELA coach will work together using a two-week coaching cycle. Every two weeks, progress will be discussed and plans moving forward will be determined. All documentation will be in a coaching log notebook.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Every two weeks

Planning - PLC meeting will address the four essential PLC questions.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - PD once or twice per month addressing our needs in regards to our initiatives - Whole Brain, Teach Like a Champion, Kagan, High Yield Strategies

Person Responsible: Rose Morrisroe (rosemo@leeschools.net)

By When: Once or twice per month

Daily Walkthroughs to ensure benchmark alignment

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianf@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

As measured by the 2022-2023 preliminary FAST assessment results, 45% of our 3-5 students were proficient in ELA. This is a four percentage point decrease from our FY22 state assessment results. As we look at specific grade levels, third grade had a 19 percentage point decrease (28%) from the prior year third grade proficiency score of 47%. The third-graders made a three percentage increase from their second grade ELA state results (25%). Our second-graders this year are coming into second grade at 61% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 62% of our students in second grade will be proficient as measured by the STAR Reading Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

- Lesson Plans
- District Assessment
- Intervention Results
- STAR Reading Progress Monitoring Results
- DIBELS Scores
- Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

- Flyleaf program will be implemented with our students who identified as having gaps in phonics. We will partner with the Academic Department at the district to provide trainings and materials for our staff.
- A systematic, intensive standard-based intervention will be in place for ELA. Our academic coach with depth of standard-based knowledge will create intentional intervention packet and make sure all stakeholders are prepared for instruction and are aware of student results.
- Imagine Learning program for LY students who meet the criteria

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Since ELA proficiency decreased in third grade from the prior year, by targeting the deficiencies in second grade we will quickly remediate and increase percent proficient.

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.

Intervention - The ESOL teacher will track student weekly progress on Imagine Learning program. When vast improvement in student progress is noticed through triangulation of data, student will be transferred to iReady standard-based computer program with ESOL teacher support and tracking for continued progress.

Person Responsible: Diana Bonilla (dianaboni@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - Students will be expected to read a book on their Zone of Proximal Development and answer three weekly questions in their writing notebook (What is the central idea? etc). The teacher will track all students using a reading log.

Person Responsible: Chelsey Faber (chelseyf@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Intervention - Create ELA intervention packets for third grade targeting low achieving benchmarks based on data. Make sure to include item specs, question stems, academic vocab, and strategies/best practices to pinpoint benchmark. Create exit ticket for grade level and make sure immediate feedback is given to all students, as well as the results are shared with all stakeholders involved. The students identified needing the Flyleaf program will use this program along with targeted standard-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Chelsey Faber (chelseyf@leeschools.net)

By When:

Tier 1 - Check lesson plans to ensure grade levels/subject areas follow pacing guidelines, the school instructional framework is followed, and school initiatives are used consistently.

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianf@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Intervention - Ensure weekly reading fluency differentiated practice sheets are practiced daily and tracked weekly to ensure progress is being made.

Person Responsible: Chelsey Faber (chelseyf@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Planning - Weekly collaborative lesson planning with reading coach to address the following areas as well as using the backwards design model:

1. Student Accommodations (at the top)
2. Daily Spotlight Benchmark, Supporting Standards, Essential Question
3. Academic Vocabulary
4. Higher Level Questions
5. I-Do, We-Do, You-Do (or beginning, middle, end in order to make a cohesive lesson for the student)
6. Exit Ticket or Reflection Activity
7. Centers and/or Kagan Structure
8. Hook/Previewing

Person Responsible: Stephanie Tubbs (stephanieat@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - Coaching cycles for will be determined through our instructional framework checklist used during walkthroughs. Admin and ELA coach will work together using a two-week coaching cycle. Every two weeks, progress will be discussed and plans moving forward will be determined. All documentation will be in a coaching log notebook.

Person Responsible: Chelsey Faber (chelseyf@leeschools.net)

By When: Every two weeks

Planning - PLC meeting will address the four essential PLC questions.

Person Responsible: Chelsey Faber (chelseyf@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier 1 - PD once or twice per month addressing our needs in regards to our initiatives - Whole Brain, Teach Like a Champion, Kagan, High Yield Strategies

Person Responsible: Rose Morrisroe (rosemo@leeschools.net)

By When: once or twice per month

Daily Walkthroughs to ensure benchmark alignment

Person Responsible: Jillian Fiora (jillianf@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

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 School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

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

The percentage of students in kindergarten through second grade using the FY22/23 screening and progress monitoring system data; who are not on track to score above the 40th percentile on the standardized ELA assessment was 44%.

Students performing below 40% in each grade are as follows; Kindergarten 30%, first grade 47%, and second grade 54%.

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

The percentage of students in 3-5 performing below level 3 on FY22/23 ELA-FAST statewide assessments were 55%. Students performing below level 3 in each grade are as follows; third grade 71%, fourth grade 44%, followed by fifth grade 49%.

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

By the end of the year 2023-24, 51% of students in each grade level, kindergarten through second grade, will show proficiency on the ELA statewide assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the year 2023-24, 51 % of students in each grade level, third through fifth grade, will show proficiency on the ELA statewide assessment.

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.

Students that scored below level 3 will have ongoing monitoring that will be completed using a variety of methods that are done daily, weekly, and quarterly. State requirements will be monitored three times a year. Using the baseline results from FAST and DIBELS, students will be placed based on deficit needs during small group instruction and intervention. Teachers and reading coaches will have lesson plans that will deliver instruction to support student's deficits. Students that are below level 3 will receive intervention using researched based curriculum as required by the District. Intervention will be delivered daily by the reading teacher and reading coaches. Students will use the i-Ready computer based reading program to practice on skill deficits. The ESOL coordinator will ensure that students with LY<2 will work on Imagine Learning program to develop their English language and monitor their performance. Teachers and reading coaches will monitor student's weekly independent reading according to their zone of proximal development level. Administration, reading coaches, and teachers will hold weekly PLC's to discuss student's performance on district assessments and state progress monitoring results. Administration will perform walkthroughs monitoring teachers adhering to to state standards being taught using a variety of strategies to enhance student learning. They will ensure that all students are receiving equitable instruction based on their needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fiora, Jillian, jillianf@leeschools.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?

The evidence-based programs that will be implemented during the 2023-2024 school year are aligned with the B.E.S.T. ELA standards, and are taught with fidelity as recommended by the state and District. In grades K-2 the following programs develop students foundational and reading skills. These programs include;

- Wonders Reading Curriculum grades K- 2
- Really Great Reading Phonics program
- DIBELS- Foundations
- FlyLeaf for intervention grade 2
- Read Well Reading Curriculum for Kindergarten- 1st grade- intervention
- i-Ready -supplement gaps in learning
- Imagine Learning for LY<2 students

In grades 3-5 the following programs are used to develop student with reading, phonics, and fluency.

- Wonders Reading Curriculum will be used for core and small group instruction
- Phonics for Reading will be used during intervention
- DIBELS- practice for fluency
- i-Ready - supplement gaps in learning
- Magnetic Reading used for intervention
- Imagine Learning for LY <2 students

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?

The evidence from State and District assessments help determine the programs needed to increase proficiency. The District selected evidence based programs to specifically address each component required for reading mastery. Spring Creek Elementary has 83% Language Learners. Therefore, results show that there is a gap in their foundational skills to reading with mastery.

The programs the District implemented for Kindergarten to use are Wonders for reading comprehension, Really Great Reading for phonemic awareness and phonics. ReadWell is used for comprehension intervention . The computer based program, i-Ready will be used for gaps within the benchmarks. The District requires grades 1 & 2 to implement Wonders Curriculum for core reading, Really Great Reading for phonics support, and FlyLeaf for intervention as well as i-Ready to fill in gaps within the benchmarks.

In grades 3-5, the District requires the implementation of Wonders Reading Curriculum for core reading instruction. For students in need of intervention, they will use the computer based program, i-Ready for filling in the deficits within the benchmarks, Magnetic Reading, and Phonics for Reading. Students that are LY<2 use Imagine Learning to build on their vocabulary and comprehension skills.

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
<p>Literacy Coaching: The percentage of students in 3-5 performing below level 3 on FY 22/23 ELA-FAST statewide assessments were 55%. Students performing below level 3 in each grade are as follows; third grade 71%, fourth grade 44%, followed by fifth grade at 49%. The action steps that will be taken to increase performance levels will require teachers to collaborate with the Literacy coaches with ongoing trainings using programs such as Magnetic Reading, Phonics for Reading, and i-Ready that are chosen and recommended by the District. Literacy coaches will establish trainings during PLCs to ensure teachers are using the programs with fidelity. Assessments will be monitored and discussed during PLCs on the benchmarks that need to be remediated during intervention. Students that are on Tier 2 and Tier 3 will use what is recommended by the intervention specialist to help increase their fluency and comprehension.</p>	<p>Tubbs, Stephanie, stephanieat@leeschools.net</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching: The percentage of students in K-2 during the FY 22/23 school year that show an area of concern in ELA are 2nd going into 3rd with 54% below the 40th percentile for growth. Kindergarten will continue to implement Read Well as their reading intervention. Grades 1-2 will focus on phonics and fluency intervention utilizing the supported materials such as Really Great Reading, and FlyLeaf as recommended by the District. Teachers and coaches will monitor the performance of students that are in the intervention program and discuss its efficacy during PLCs. As an additional layer of support, the District APPLES Program will be implemented.</p>	<p>Faber, Chelsey, chelseyf@leeschools.net</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership: The Leadership Team will monitor exemplar, progress monitoring and iReady Data to ensure student learning. The administration team will conduct walk-throughs and analyze the data/trends. The Leadership team will continue to be trained on Coaching strategies and the new coaching cycle will be explained to new teachers and teachers who require additional support. Based on classroom trends via walk-throughs and observations, Leadership will be trained on high-yield strategies and guide teacher/grade levels accordingly,</p>	<p>Fiora, Jillian, jillianlf@leeschools.net</p>
<p>Assessment: Formal and Informal Assessments will be conducted via weekly intervention exit tickets. Exemplars will be completed and monitored during PLCs and Leadership. Additionally, assessment data will be posted in each teachers classroom providing a breakdown of benchmark data. All Progress Monitoring data will be completed, analyzed and students will be sorted according to Tiers 1-3 with interventions in place to assist accordingly.</p>	<p>Fiora, Jillian, jillianlf@leeschools.net</p>

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.

- School Improvement Plans (SIPs) must be created and managed using the Florida CIMS website. This will allow for our completed SIPs to be made available publicly and parents can request a copy from the school's front office in their preferred language after publication approval.
- On Aug 1, 2023, schools must have SIPs reviewed by Academic Services & Title I Depts
- On or before Oct 6, 2023, School Advisory Council (SAC) must present, review, and request feedback on the SIP and budget. The meeting minutes will be uploaded into the school's Title I Crate (web-based site) and FY24 School document folder in the google team drive.
- On Oct 17, 2023, The Lee County School Board will approve publication and dissemination.
- Schools must review Annual School Improvement Assurances, complete & submit School Advisory Council Membership List 2023-2024, complete & submit School Advisory Council 2022-2023 Nomination and Election Process Verification on or before Nov 1, 2023, in the google drive FY24 School Document Folder.

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))

Spring Creek Elementary recognizes the enormous importance of increasing parental and family engagement in raising student achievement at all levels. To accomplish this and to determine the needs/barriers of our parents, schools, the PFEP team analyzes the current building capacity activities, compares participation numbers, and addresses the barriers that limit parent participation. These barriers include lack of transportation to meetings, language barriers, childcare, feelings of intimidation, inability to leave work for events/meetings and in general the difficulties with the current economic conditions.

In addition, since we are a Title I school, we complete the Florida DOE template for the Parent and Family Educational Plan (PFEP). School data is reported to the district to become a part of the District PFEP Evaluation and goal setting process. Schools' baseline data sources, i.e., number of volunteers and volunteer service hours, become the guiding force to annual evaluation and improvement of the school's parent involvement program to enhance student achievement for the upcoming school year.

Other sources of data may include but are not limited to parent workshop and training evaluations, sign in sheets, attendance and volunteer logs, parent surveys, the Title I Crate, the PFEP Evaluation, the School Academic Training and Workshop forms, and test results.

The PFEP will be a principal element of the review process for each school in gathering data at the end of the year as the schools complete their SIP (Comprehensive Needs Analysis) in preparation for revising School Improvement Plans.

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)

Spring Creek Elementary Title I funds will be utilized to strengthen our academic programs, ensure quality of learning time, and provide enriched/accelerated curriculum.

- Hiring qualified teachers and instructional support staff
- PD opportunities to improve teacher quality made available using Title I funds
- Offering extended day tutoring programs for students performing below proficiency.
- Curriculum and Development Supplemental Contracts for processing for improvement include ongoing data chats at the classroom level, data review and instructional change, baseline/midyear/final, and

adjustments to align curriculum, resources, and the results for assessments aligned to Florida's academic standards.

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))

District general funds provide the foundation for all programs. Title I A funds will be the primary supplemental source for the activities listed in this need. Title I, Part A coordinates with other federal grants, such as Titles 1C, 1D, II, III and IV, IDEA, and Homeless to expand academic enrichment opportunities for subgroups of students and Professional Development for teachers. These services include extended learning opportunities, professional development, supplemental evidence-based resources, and materials.

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title I, Part C to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities to Migrant students. Services include; tutorials in reading and math, health services, and literacy workshops for parents because of the coordination of these funds.

Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under ESEA also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs to align towards student academic success.

Collaborative partners include Early Childhood Services (Head Start, VPK), local Literacy Council; Florida Gulf Coast University; Florida SouthWestern State College; and Local Chamber of Commerce. Activities with Early Childhood include blended VPK/Title I classrooms for four-year-olds. This is a voluntary program that identifies elevated risk students to receive a full year of educational opportunities. The benefits for students include readiness for kindergarten and focusing on building literacy for early reading skills. The expected outcome is for the four-year-old's who participate in the programs to be able to perform at the readiness level in all areas of the kindergarten readiness screening.

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))

Students who are in need of counseling support are given an opportunity to meet weekly with the guidance counselor. Lunch sessions are provided for group support or private for students that are in need of one on one support.

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))

Not applicable.

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).

Spring Creek Elementary has implemented the PBiS program to support and enhance student behaviors within the school and classroom.

Students are taught school wide expectations using our acronym P.R.I.D.E (perseverance, resilience, integrity, determination, enthusiasm).

Spring Creek has also incorporated the house system. Students are placed in each of the five houses and are rewarded points for their colored house based on their behavior and improvement on academics.

We have quarterly celebrations to celebrate achievements.

Students that require more intensive services are then placed in a multi tiered program, MTSS.

Individualized plans are created and implemented by the teacher and monitored.

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))

Coaches and teachers attend weekly PLCs to discuss data. During this time, they review the performance of each student and create a plan with strategies to implement during intervention.

All stakeholders have monthly staff meetings to discuss expectations as well as required trainings that will help them to facilitate learning in the classroom.

Administration and reading coaches meet with paraprofessionals in guiding them and training them with curriculum that is utilized within the classroom.

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))

Spring Creek Elementary provides VPK and Young Five programs for students who qualify under the Title 1 statutes.

This includes full day programs that ensures students are successful when starting kindergarten. These programs enable the teacher to help students develop the required skills necessary for continued success.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------

Budget Approval

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

Yes