Rock Springs Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Rock Springs Elementary

2400 ROCK SPRINGS RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://rockspringses.ocps.net/

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, 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
Darr, Kari	Principal	The school principal, will ensure a safe learning environment, monitor all student data, ensure the implementation of instructional best practices, and coach teachers to perform to the best of their ability. The school principal will also monitor instruction and data and provide timely and actionable feedback for improving classroom instruction.
Hall, Karen	Assistant Principal	The school assistant principal will help the principal with ensuring a safe learning environment, monitoring all student data, ensuring implementation of instructional best practices, and coaching teachers to perform to the best of their ability. The assistant principal will also monitor instruction and data and provide timely yet effective feedback for improving classroom instruction.
Leonard, Amanda	Other	The MTSS coach will provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers as it relates to the MTSS process and all school-wide interventions in Reading and Math.
Guillen, Vanessa	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ELL Compliance Specialist will provide ongoing professional development and resources to teachers as it relates to instructional techniques, supports, and scaffolds for English Language Learners.
Hernandez, Lymarie	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach will provide ongoing professional development, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to instruction. She will support our new and beginning teachers through ongoing and targeted professional development.
DeLuca, Alicia	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist is responsible for coordinating the staffing and educational planning process for students with IEPs on campus. She provides professional development when necessary to the staff.

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.

Rock Springs Elementary's School Advisory Council (SAC) is the primary means for all stakeholders to provide input into the school improvement process. SAC has a representation of families, business community partners, and staff who share an interest in Rock Springs. SAC and the Faculty Advisory Committee also provide input on the school's general budget. Also, in the Spring of 2023, school staff, parents, students, and families provided input on school climate through the Panorama survey.

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))

The School Improvement Plan is the driving force for Rock Springs's identified needs. The Area of Focus will be monitored through standard-based unit assessments with a focus on subgroups. The data collected along with stakeholder feedback was considered when creating the SIP. Progress monitoring data will also be shared and discussed at SAC meetings. In addition, staff and family surveys will be conducted monthly to determine the next steps to support school culture.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	5	42	39	35	26	22	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	0	9	2	4	8	7	0	0	0	30
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	34	17	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	40	23	0	0	0	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	25	33	22	0	0	0	80

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	16	12	13	41	22	0	0	0	104

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	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	60	42	35	25	30	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	4	1	4	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	3	2	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	15	32	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	23	31	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	23	17	28	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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	10	60	42	35	25	30	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	4	1	4	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	3	2	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	15	32	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	23	31	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	23	17	28	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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*	48	57	53	46	56	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				52			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			29		
Math Achievement*	46	60	59	50	46	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				58			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			39		
Science Achievement*	56	63	54	53	61	59	56		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	42	59	59	54			39		

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	241
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	13	Yes	2	2
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	43			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	59			
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	16	Yes	1	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	42			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	46			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			46			56					42
SWD	13			8			5				5	20
ELL	30			28			33				5	42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			39			46				4	
HSP	42			41			49				5	40
MUL	65			75							2	
PAC												
WHT	54			50			74				4	
FRL	39			38			44				5	40

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	52	30	50	58	40	53					54
SWD	7	22	27	15	13	16	11					
ELL	30	45	22	30	57	38	23					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	59		47	67		20					
HSP	38	46	21	43	55	37	42					52
MUL	62			92								
PAC												
WHT	55	50	29	53	48	36	67					
FRL	40	52	38	44	59	44	42					52

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	55	51	29	50	55	39	56					39
SWD	22	32	17	20	42	27	18					
ELL	45	40	30	43	42	20	45					39
AMI												
ASN	100			73								
BLK	53	55		49	55		50					
HSP	51	46	33	47	53	41	56					38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	51		54	62		62					
FRL	52	45	25	42	41	11	43					38

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	52%	54%	-2%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	60%	-5%	58%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	52%	-7%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	59%	-17%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	51%	4%

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.

According to the 2022-2023 FAST Data, our lowest performing categories are Students with Disabilities with 81% not proficient in ELA, and English Language Learners with 84% not proficient. Rock Springs has had a difficult time staffing the school, including additional support staff specific to these areas. Finding qualified staff for these areas has continued to be a trend.

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

According to the 2021-2022 FSA data, Rock Springs had a 50% proficiency in the area of Math. In the 2022-2023 school year, according to the FAST data, Rock Springs had a 48% proficiency in the area of Math. The time of the math block decreased from 60 minutes to 45 minutes daily, as well as students demonstrating weaker math fluency in foundational math skills.

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.

According to the FAST PM3, Rock Springs is below the state average of 58% proficiency for 3-5 Math. Rock Springs had 48% proficiency for math in grades 3-5; specifically at 44% in 3rd grade, 55% in 4th

grade, and 47% in 5th grade. Contributing factors are students lacking math fluency and a decrease in instructional math time.

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

According to the 2021-2022 FSA data, Rock Springs had 46% proficiency in the area of ELA. In the 2022-2023 school year, according to FAST data, Rock Springs had 52% proficiency in the area of ELA. Instruction focused greatly on the small group areas with consistent and intentional instruction.

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

Rock Springs's highest areas of concern are attendance and Level 1 on Statewide Math Assessments. In K-5, we have 69 students absent 10% or more days from the school year. We also have 68 students in grades 3-5 score a level 1 on the 2022-2023 Statewide Math Assessment.

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

1. English Language Learner increase in proficiency in ELA and Math.
2. Students with Disabilities increased in proficiency in ELA and Math.
3. Increase overall proficiency in Math for all students.

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.

Based on the Panorama Survey from Spring 2023, Rock Springs noted that there was a 5% decrease in the favorable rating of school climate overall.

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

In the Spring 2024 Panorama Survey, our goal is to increase the perception of school leadership and school climate favorable rating by 25%.

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

Staff will have the opportunity to complete monthly staff surveys regarding targeted culture and climate. Based on the monthly results, the leadership team will make adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kari Darr (kari.darr@ocps.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.)

To raise teacher retention rates, Rock Springs will utilize needs assessments and quarterly climate surveys to provide teachers with a professional voice within a school building which evidence has shown to strengthen climate and a teacher's sense of belonging to Rock Springs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates for sustainable improvement efforts to be valued, collective ownership and understanding is necessary.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

1. Create a committee--- ask for teacher and staff volunteers to join the culture and climate committee.

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

By When: September 2023

2. Review Panorama Survey data from Spring 2023.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 2023

3. Ask for thoughts, opinions, and possible solutions for improved perception of school leadership effectiveness.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Monthly and ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

According to the 2022-2023 FAST Data, our lowest performing categories are Students with Disabilities with 81% not proficient in ELA, and English Language Learners with 84% not proficient.

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

Rock Springs will increase proficiency for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learner students to 41%.

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

Proficiency in these two areas will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring 1, 2 and 3, in conjunction with Standards Based Unit Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Hall (karen.hall@ocps.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.)

Rock Springs is targeting these two groups through specific small group instruction, using research-based materials (e.g.: SIPPS, Becoming a Reader, leveled readers, etc.).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated instruction allows for teachers to deliver instruction that meets the individual needs of the student, in a small group setting.

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

Tier 2 - Moderate 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.

1. Baseline data collected for all students

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

By When: August 31, 2023

2. Create groups and identify students in subgroups

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

By When: September 2023

3. Small group differentiated groups

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

By When: September 2023

4. Monitor individual and group performance on FAST PM 1,2, and 3 and Standards-Based Unit Assessments

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Professional Development will be provided based on teacher and student needs

Person Responsible: Lymarie Hernandez (lyrmarie.hernandez@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

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 Advisory Committee as well as the Budget Committee will meet to discuss funding allocations and ensure that resources are being purchased and used based on student needs. The areas of focus identified were Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. We have increased our personnel that work with ESE students. Researched-based materials will be used with ELL students in small group settings. We will also use funds to supplement materials for interventions as well as professional development to ensure instruction and students' tasks are aligned with grade-level standards. Funds will also be used to support after-school tutoring for identified students, including SWD and ELL subgroups.

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

n/a

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

Based on the 2023 FAST PM 3, 46% of third graders performed at a level 3 or higher. We will target reading foundational and comprehension skills in reading intervention and small groups, which will support an increase in students performing on grade level.

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

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Rock Springs plans to increase students' proficiency in grade 3 from 46% to 65% based on FAST PM 3.

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.

Student progress will be monitored through FAST, intervention programs, and common assessments. Student progress will also be monitored through the use of weekly instructional walkthroughs completed by administrators and leadership team members.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Darr, Kari, kari.darr@ocps.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?

Identified students will use Becoming a Reader during small group instruction along with SIPPS during the intervention. Both evidence-based programs are moderate and align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Program and B.E.S.T Standards. Data will be collected from both programs and discussed monthly. Adjustments will be made based on student data.

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?

Identified students will be placed in the evidence-based program based on their performance on the screener. We will be utilizing both Becoming a Reader and SIPPS since they have shown effectiveness for our target population. SIPPS also teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words and helps to build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words. Being a Reader helps to develop student awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and provides purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The literacy coach will attend district coach meetings. The coach will use data to identify personnel and areas of need. She will also implement of coaching cycle, modeling, PLC, and planning support for ELL and ESE students.	Hernandez, Lymarie, lyrmarie.hernandez@ocps.net
The academic team will meet weekly to review student data and needed support. Based on data collected adjustments will be made.	Leonard, Amanda, amanda.leonard@ocps.net

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$47,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	630000	1001000000	1011 - Rock Springs Elementary	General Fund	130.0	$47,500.00
			Notes: ESOL Compliance Specialist			
					Total:	$47,500.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes