

Seminole County Public Schools

Winter Springs 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	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Winter Springs Elementary School

701 W STATE ROAD 434, Winter Springs, FL 32708

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0391>

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.

Winter Springs Elementary, in partnership with our families and community, provides a positive learning environment where students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens and lifelong learners in our global economy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Winter Springs Elementary School is to create a dynamic learning environment that involves our students in rigorous curriculum and interactive technology, resulting in our students being prepared for 21st century globally competitive work.

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
Ramkissoon, Kristen	Principal	Instructional Leader, Administrative School Budget, PLC Data Chats, SAC, PTA, Classroom and Behavior Support, Parent and Staff Communication, and Non-Instructional Evaluations/Initiatives.
Pernal, Adolph	Assistant Principal	Test Coordinator, Administrative PLC Data Chats, ELA and Math Intervention, MTSS, Student Study, ESE, ESOL, Dividend Coordinator, PBS, Professional Development, Master Calendar.
Akard, Bonnie	Math Coach	Math iReady Champion, MTSS, Intervention Facilitator, Lead Tutorial Teacher, Classroom. Support, Data Analysis, PLC Meetings, K-5 Resource and support
Haynes, Ruth	Reading Coach	ELA iReady Champion, MTSS, Intervention Facilitator, Lead Tutorial Teacher, Classroom Support, Data Analysis, PLC Meetings, K-5 Resource and support
Ayala, Nicole	School Counselor	Student Study, MTSS, Small Group-Social Emotional Resource, Truancy, Social Work, Hospital Homebound, OT/PT, ESE Student Study
Jones, Missy	Instructional Coach	ETF, SMART Lab Teacher, Science Classroom Support, Club Sponsor, K-5 CS202, Blended Learning and Science PLC', News Room equipment and training crew
Millen, Jane	Behavior Specialist	Title 1, Family and Community Liaison, Business Partners, Classroom Support, FIN Coordinator.

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.

Winter Springs Elementary School employs parent and community involvement through various survey collections and local School Advisory Meetings. Stakeholders provide input to establish common goals and ideals aligned to our Seminole County mission and school-wide goals. Input is utilized to collaborate and develop plans such as family events to impact the welfare and success of the school. Winter Springs encourages participation from a diverse population of families to ensure a fair representation of plan development.

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 administrative team alongside our academic coaches will regularly gather academic performance data, including standardized test scores, formative assessments, and other relevant indicators. Analyze this data to identify trends, patterns, and areas of concern, particularly those related to students with the greatest achievement gaps.

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	69%
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: A
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	25	20	15	25	12	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	22	9	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	28	11	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	6	13	18	6	0	0	0	49

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	8	4	9	27	10	0	0	0	58

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	2	9	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	1	8	3	1	2	5	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	5	15	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	13	16	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	9	6	36	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	4	6	6	2	4	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	8	2	8	3	1	0	0	0	24
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	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	2	9	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	1	8	3	1	2	5	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	5	15	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	13	16	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	9	6	36	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	4	6	6	2	4	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	8	2	8	3	1	0	0	0	24
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*	57	61	53	56	65	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				53			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			45		
Math Achievement*	58	64	59	53	46	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				62			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			35		
Science Achievement*	60	65	54	44	65	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	79	77	59	66			75		

* 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
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	52

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
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	35	Yes	4	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	60			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	2
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	48			

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	57			58			60					79
SWD	31			29			18				5	73
ELL	33			47							4	79
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	61			55			43				3	
HSP	55			57			65				5	78
MUL	27			64							2	
PAC												
WHT	58			58			67				4	
FRL	54			55			59				5	82

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	56	53	38	53	62	45	44					66
SWD	24	32	42	29	39	33	6					
ELL	37	38		38	44							66
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	37	52	53	35	48	36	11					
HSP	57	46	27	47	56	27	44					64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65	61	23	64	70	75	57					
FRL	49	48	36	47	59	44	36					67

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	52	48	45	41	37	35	46					75
SWD	20	50	42	12	28	33	29					75
ELL	29	50		32	25		31					75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			26								
HSP	53	44		36	28		39					77
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	52		50	45		59					
FRL	50	47	47	37	36	37	42					76

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	66%	-2%	58%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	60%	-18%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	66%	-17%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	68%	3%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	44%	10%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	64%	-8%	51%	5%

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.

After disaggregating the data we found that the greatest need for improvement was our 3rd grade Black/African American students.

Our 3rd grade Black/African American students were 14% proficient on PM1, and on PM 3, 35% were proficient. This is the lowest proficiency percentage out of any of our subgroups.

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

Our largest decline was the statewide assessment scores among 3rd grade students. Many factors have contributed to this decline, such as new testing standards, new assessments, and a completely new 3rd grade teaching team. We are working hard to ensure that this shortcoming does not continue in a downward trend.

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 a slight gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of Black/African American students and students with disabilities

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

Our 4th grade math and 5th grade ELA students made the greatest learning gains from PM1 to PM3.

74% of our 4th and 5th grade students from PM1 to PM3. and 64% of the were proficient.

Strategic and targeted intervention. Differentiated small groups and guided reading lessons.

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.

- Student achievement
- Teacher retention
- School morale
- Fostering effective leaders
- Community involvement

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 and Black/African American 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 and Black/African American 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:

Kristen Ramkissoon (kristen_ramkissoon@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?

We want all students to be proficient in reading, and math based on their grade level. Additionally, we want our ESSA and RAISE groups as defined above to make learning gains of 50 points in iReady from the beginning of the year to the end of the year.

How will we know if they learn it?

We will know if they learned it based on their progress monitoring data on iReady, FAST, and STAR. Intervention data points, formative and summative assessments, as well as teacher observation will serve to give a holistic view of where the student is individually.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

We will meet regularly during PLC meetings and discuss best practices for teaching students the material in different ways. Also, we will utilize our MTSS time to provide students with tiered intervention as needed based on teacher observation, data, and student grades.

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

Evidence will be apparent in formative assessments in iReady, FAST, and STAR.

Person Responsible: Kristen Ramkissoon (kristen_ramkissoon@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:

Kristen Ramkissoon (kristen_ramkissoon@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.

Ensure every student has a trusted adult that they feel comfortable with.

Members of the leadership team will work to ensure that they are being seen in classrooms on a regular basis. The school counselor will work with SEL groups based on a needs assessment that will be given.

Student behavior in my class(es) makes it difficult for me to learn.

Review student expectations daily on the morning news, increase our PBS Golden Ticket program in order to incentivise proper behavior.

Person Responsible: Kristen Ramkissoon (kristen_ramkissoon@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

N/A

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

N/A

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.

Ramkissoon, Kristen, kristen_ramkissoon@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.

Ramkissoon, Kristen,
 kristen_ramkissoon@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.

Winter Springs Elementary School employs parent and community involvement through various survey collections and local School Advisory Meetings. Stakeholders provide input to establish common goals and ideals aligned to our Seminole County mission and school-wide goals. Input is utilized to collaborate and develop plans such as family events to impact the welfare and success of the school. Winter Springs encourages participation from a diverse population of families to ensure a fair representation of plan development.

<https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0391>

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))

Winter Springs Elementary School's motto is "Swimming Towards Success" We strive to make sure that all families feel welcome upon entry as part of our team. As new students arrive teachers build class rapport and acquaint students with WSES traditions and friendly culture. Parents are our partners. Teachers communicate daily through planners and schedule conferences several times a year or more as needed. Administration communicates family involvement events and school information via marquee, weekly school-wide communication, Skyward, grade level newsletters, and social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook. In addition, flyers and letters are sent in multiple languages to ensure that all families have the opportunity to understand the details.

<https://wses.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)

We will utilize several strategies to strengthen the academic program, such as:

- Accelerated courses, including Ramp and talent development.
- Extended learning opportunities in academic and enrichment areas. Our tutorial program serves to bolster academic knowledge, and our optional music, and visual arts programs can benefit our students looking for a more creative outlet.
- Provide ongoing professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their instructional strategies, content knowledge, and classroom management skills.
- Regularly assess student progress using formative and summative assessments to identify areas of improvement and adjust the curriculum accordingly.

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.