

Seminole County Public Schools

Spring Lake 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Spring Lake Elementary School

695 ORANGE AVE, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0401>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

SCPS Mission Statement: The mission of the Seminole County Public Schools is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. Parent and Family Engagement Mission Statement: Spring Lake Elementary School endeavors to provide ongoing encouragement, information and opportunities for every family to play a valuable role in the education of their children. Parents and teachers will collaborate in a cooperative environment where all parties feel validated and work towards preparing all students to become responsible, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spring Lake will exemplify excellent teaching and evidence-based instructional practices aligned to the state standards while building positive relationships that result in high levels of achievement for all students.

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
Jose, Debbie	Principal	SIP, Low Quartile, MTSS, SST, Teacher Feedback, PBS, Emergency Response, Teacher/Staff Evaluations, PD, PLCs, PTA, Budget, SAC, Communication
Cashion, Kellie	Assistant Principal	MTSS, Low Quartile, Teacher Feedback, Emergency Response, Teacher Evaluation, Progress Monitoring, PD, PLCs, Climate Surveys, Calendars, PTA, Tutorial, SLC, Textbooks
Berry, Kammi	Administrative Support	PBS, Emergency Response, Staff Evaluations, PTA, Families in Need, Calendars, Business Partners, Dividends, Title 1, Testing Coordinator, Newsletters
Heath, Bethany	School Counselor	MTSS, PBS, Guidance Services, SST, Behavior Interventions, Crisis Support, Families in Need, Title 1
Hines, Carisa	Attendance/Social Work	MTSS, Truancy, Social Skills/SEL Lessons, Behavior Interventions, Families in Need, Home-School Liaison, Title 1
Jones, Laura	Instructional Coach	MTSS, SIP, Data Monitoring, Low Quartile, Peer Feedback/Mentor, PD, PLCs, Tutorial Programs
Bell-Wright, Robin	Instructional Coach	MTSS, SIP, Data Monitoring, Low Quartile, Peer Feedback/Mentor, PD, PLCs, Tutorial Programs

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.

The School Improvement Plan is developed in collaboration with the School Advisory Council (SAC), which includes parent representatives. The draft plan is presented and parent input is provided during a beginning of the year SAC meeting. Community newsletters and School Improvement Plan (SIP) overview information are shared with parents in both English and Spanish.

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))

1. Weekly leadership meetings.
2. Weekly data reviews of iReady, science formatives and grade level assessments that reflect ELA, Math and Science standards.

3. Data chats with grade levels and individual teachers will take place.
4. During MTSS sessions data will be reviewed and data-based decisions will be made.
5. During PLC sessions lesson planning will be targeted on addressing students' needs.
6. During SAC meetings, data will be shared.
7. Lesson plans and gradebooks will be consistently monitored

The plan will be revised as necessary based on these data reviews as well as what the data is telling us about student growth and 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	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	32	37	30	22	17	0	0	0	141	
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	7	4	2	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	1	3	7	1	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	29	17	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	23	22	0	0	0	49	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	33	33	21	16	0	0	0	118	

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	10	17	23	28	21	0	0	0	99

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	13	25	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	16	26	0	0	0	52	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	

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	1	3	8	9	7	0	0	0	28

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	1	15	7	4	0	0	0	28
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	13	25	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	16	26	0	0	0	52	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	

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	1	3	8	9	7	0	0	0	28

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	1	15	7	4	0	0	0	28
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*	45	61	53	40	65	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				48			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			41		
Math Achievement*	47	64	59	42	46	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				41			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30			6		
Science Achievement*	51	65	54	37	65	59	56		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	79	77	59	52			76		

* 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	259
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
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	10	Yes	4	2
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	48			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	48			

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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	1	1
HSP	42			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	45			47			51					79
SWD	12			9							3	
ELL	39			39			57				5	79
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			41			47				4	
HSP	42			43			45				5	78
MUL	67			75							2	
PAC												
WHT	50			58			63				4	
FRL	42			42			43				5	76

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	40	48	48	42	41	30	37					52
SWD	20	33	38	22	19	20	20					
ELL	37	60		42	44	50	41					52
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	28	40		29	27	13	13					
HSP	37	44	38	42	43	43	40					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	56		49	47		52					
FRL	36	43	46	37	35	28	32					51

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	45	51	41	50	54	6	56					76
SWD	21	50		23	33		55					
ELL	44	50		58	63		60					76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	50		30	33		35					
HSP	38	56		48	58		58					76
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	36		63	67		71					
FRL	42	52	44	46	51	6	51					74

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%	61%	-10%	54%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	66%	-17%	58%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	31%	60%	-29%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	66%	-25%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	68%	-22%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	44%	-9%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	64%	-16%	51%	-3%

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.

There is a need for improvement in both ELA and Math.

Areas of need in ELA:

Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary (Grades 3-5)

Areas of need in Math:

Geometric Reasoning, Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability (Grade 3-5)

Number Sense and Operations with Fractions and Decimals(Grade 4, 5)

The contributing factors and actions that would need to to taken:

1. Aggressive monitoring (Data Analysis)
2. Strengthening PLC sessions
3. Providing PD to address areas of need in ELA and Math
4. Strategic coaching to support new/beginning /struggling teachers
5. Strategic planning of intervention/intervention support
6. Careful planning for tutorial support
7. Lesson plan monitoring
8. Consistent walk-through feedback
9. Students' tracking their own data
10. The implementation of the Accelerated Reader program.

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

The greatest decline was both in the area of ELA and Math.
Contributions to this decline included:

1. Lack of focus on standards-based instruction.
2. Lack of monitoring on data analysis and planning targeted lessons
3. Behavior concerns within the school that effected in-class obstruction
4. Poor school commitment.

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.

3rd grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students in multiple subgroups.

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

Spring Lake had the greatest improvement in the area of fifth grade Science. Our school increased from 37% to 48% proficient.

Contributing Factors:

1. Strong PLC sessions
2. Consistent support from district coaches and administration
3. Monitoring of classroom instruction

New Actions:

1. Aggressive monitoring
2. STEM teacher will support Gr. 5 science with lessons that focus on science vocabulary
3. STEM teacher will support Gr. 5 science with labs that focus on all areas of science
4. Data analysis and careful planning following each formative and SBA

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

1. Strengthen PLC sessions with a focus on standard-based instruction. This will include standard-based center rotations.
2. Restructure and strengthen PBIS by establishing new school-wide expectations.
3. Continuous and consistent feedback on instruction, as well as the conditions for learning within the classroom.
4. Strengthen monitoring of the following; PLC sessions, instruction within the classroom, student performance, MTSS sessions, and gradebooks
5. Instill a sense of pride within our staff and students.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to 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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities, Black/African American students and free reduced lunch students. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities, Black/African American students and free reduced lunch students.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Debbie Jose (debbie_jose@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, iReady or iStation, Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools), Reading Mastery, FastForward, Corrective Reading, Quick Reads and Elements of Reading.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

What do we want all students to do?

The primary goal is that all students will be proficient with the B.E.S.T Standards. The secondary goal is to ensure that our students make learning gains in the areas of ELA and Math.

How will we know if they learn it?

We will know if they have learned it by the results that we note on the following assessments: formative assessments, quizzes, chapter tests, unit tests, iReady Diagnostic assessments, FAST

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

Our response to students that do not learn:

1. Purposeful PLC sessions that focus on planning engaging lessons to address the needs of individual students (remediation) .
2. Strengthening center rotations so that activities are focused on standards.
3. Weekly data review sessions will take place. These sessions will focus on trends in the data and addressing those trends.
4. Tutorial sessions
5. MTSS review and monitoring
6. Leadership meetings (weekly) with a focus on academics
7. Guidance meetings (weekly) with a focus on behavior
8. Monthly meetings with the ESE team and ELL team to review students' progress

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?

1. PLC notes.
2. Leadership team notes
3. Individual teacher data chats
4. MTSS notes in EdInsight
5. Tutorial attendance sheets
6. Walk-through data

Person Responsible: Debbie Jose (debbie_jose@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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 succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5 Essentials Survey indicators for trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism will increase to or remain Well Organized.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Debbie Jose (debbie_jose@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Survey Element- Trusted Adults and Discipline-- Conditions for Learning/Restorative Practices
All staff members will participate in a day and half training on the Conditions for Learning. (PBIS and relationship- building included) A behavior support team will be formed to support teachers throughout the school year.

Focus- Collective Responsibility and Trust-

Collective Responsibility: build capacity, provide professional development for areas of need, schedule "Monthly Matters" sessions where staff can share feelings, worries and frustrations. designate responsibilities

Person Responsible: Debbie Jose (debbie_jose@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 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)).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).

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

For grades K, 1 and 2, coaches at RAISE schools will receive extra support from the State Regional Literacy Director through Professional Development that Just Read, Florida! has developed. In turn, coaches will use this professional development to improve the support to teachers at their respective schools. This should support more explicit, systematic, benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms to lead to improvement in student outcomes on state assessments.

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

For grade 3, coaches at RAISE schools will receive extra support from the State Regional Literacy Director through Professional Development that Just Read, Florida! has developed. In turn, coaches will use this professional development to improve the support to teachers at their respective schools. This should support more explicit, systematic, benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms to lead to improvement in student outcomes on state assessments.

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

The number of students in grades K-2 that are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment will decrease by 2 percent.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The number of students in grade 3 that score below a Level 3 on the end of the year statewide ELA assessment will decrease by 2 percent.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA, FAST and district progress monitoring assessment outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jose, Debbie, debbie_jose@scps.k12.fl.us

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?

Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.

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?

By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention.

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
Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data. Utilizing results of FAST PM1 and PM2, DRA and district progress monitoring to design reading acceleration support for students. Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions. Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction. Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block. Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.	Jose, Debbie, debbie_jose@scps.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan is developed in collaboration with the School Advisory Council (SAC), which includes parent representatives. The draft plan is presented and parent input is provided during a beginning of the year SAC meeting. Community newsletters and School Improvement Plan (SIP) overview information are shared with parents in both English and Spanish.

<https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0401>

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))

Teachers and administrators use multiple strategies to contact families, including but not limited to, (1) contacting families prior to the start of school to welcome the students to the new school year, (2) inviting families to curriculum nights and open house meetings to meet teachers and school staff and to learn about the curriculum, (3) providing access to school grades, progress monitoring data, and other relevant achievement information through the SCPS Skyward Family Access Portal, (4) ensuring students show evidence of "owning their data" and involving parents in APTT night events, (5) inviting families to participate in SAC and PTA Boards, (6) inviting families to attend PTA meetings and participate in school related events, (7) using multiple genres of social networking, as well as sending electronic/paper-based newsletters to families on a regular basis, (8) advertising events on school marquees, (9) and numerous other out-reach strategies developed by school staff.

<https://springlake.scps.k12.fl.us/>

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 Lake Elementary is participating in school-wide Restorative Practices training and implementation along with SCPS Behavior Coaching Academy. These supports will proactively address how all staff build rapport with students as well as the response to behaviors to maximize instructional time. Spring Lake Elementary will be supported by district instructional coaches in the areas of math, ELA, and science. Monitoring will be scheduled and consistent with Spring Lake Administration.

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))

During the planning phase of Title I school-wide plans, which typically begins late February or early March for the upcoming school year, leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), ESOL World Languages and Student Access (Title III, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Student Assignment and Program Access (magnet programs), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK) are invited to participate in collaborative planning sessions. At these collaborative planning sessions, school leadership teams begin developing their Title I, Part A plans for the upcoming school year, with support and guidance from these various district-level grant and/or program managers. For instance, the Director of ESOL/World Languages and Student Access would share with Title I school leadership teams relevant updates to those programs for the upcoming school year, which may lead them to leverage their Title I, Part A funds to supplement such initiatives.