

Orange 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Spring Lake Elementary

1105 SARAH LEE LN, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://springlakees.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 provide all students equitable and engaging learning experiences within a safe and supportive learning environment. Everyday. And, 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
Wilkins, Aja	Principal	Oversees all instructional programs, and classroom instruction, coaches, teachers, and PLCs. Skyward support, master scheduling. SAC committee, School Improvement Plan, Professional Development presenter, Evaluations, School budget, Threat assessment team, hiring, discipline, and PBIS support.
Warkentien, Gina	Assistant Principal	Oversees instructional programs, and classroom instruction. Coaches teachers and supports in PLCs. Skyward Lead, master scheduling, PTO support, School Improvement Plan, Professional Development presenter, House System Lead, PBIS Lead, Schedules (support staff), Threat assessment team, Skyward Lead, Summer School, Safety, Textbook manager.
Plata, Ashley	Reading Coach	Lead ELA PLCs for our faculty, and ensure that all Reading plans are on standard and rigorous. Ms. Plata also monitors classroom instruction and gives feedback to our instructional staff. In addition, she is our Lead Mentor. New teacher academy, ATS tutoring coordinator
Huntzinger, Stacy	ELL Compliance Specialist	Support with intervention, monitor implementation of programs for intervention and ELL, MAster data sheet for ELL and intervention, Lead in ESOL (data, compliance, testing, meetings)
Sahadeo, Stephanie	Math Coach	Support with K-5 math implementation of benchmarks, MTSS, Intervention, assessments, and data. Math/science contact for the district, monitor Impact training attendance for Math and science. Deliver Professional Development related to Math/Science.

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 SAC met in May 2023 to discuss the next steps for the 2023-2024 school year. Spring Lake will continue to utilize our Tier 1 intervention teachers to support through pushing in small groups and working with a targeted group of students while tracking growth data towards proficiency. There will also be a focus on ESOL students by utilizing an Intervention teacher and other support personnel to monitor students on the Imagine learning system and Language for Learning and communicating this back to teachers and families. Allowing for the student's team is aware of the growth or need for support. We will meet with the SAC as well as present to staff data after each B.E.S.T assessment and any next steps to support students' journey to proficiency.

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 administration team will monitor goals monthly to ensure our actions will lead us to meet the goals.

Demographic Data	
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	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	8	21	22	14	14	21	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	7
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	1	18	14	0	0	4	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	15	17	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	20	20	15	18	0	0	0	0	73

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	10	5	20	15	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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	4	6	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	15	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	13	0	0	0	16
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	0	0	2	4	7	0	0	0	13

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
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	2	4	6	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	15	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	13	0	0	0	16
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	0	0	2	4	7	0	0	0	13

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47	57	56	55	57	57
ELA Learning Gains	40	62	61	67	58	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	20	50	52	70	52	53
Math Achievement*	52	61	60	62	63	63
Math Learning Gains	53	66	64	60	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46	56	55	48	48	51
Science Achievement*	52	56	51	53	56	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	50			63		

* 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	41			

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)

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	47	40	20	52	53	46	52					50
SWD	20	17	19	21	39	44	24					37
ELL	33	39	18	40	53	47	41					50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	41	40	20	48	56	52	52					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	43		65	57		57					
FRL	44	35	11	54	55	42	45					45

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	56	67	48	41	35	42					43
SWD	32	55		29	73							31
ELL	44	60	73	40	42	36	34					43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	51	60	71	49	48	44	43					43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71	50		51	29		44					
FRL	53	58	67	44	37	38	40					43

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	55	67	70	62	60	48	53					63
SWD	19	52	54	19	43	40	8					46
ELL	37	63	78	54	63	54	45					63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58			42								
HSP	46	67	76	58	63	51	43					62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	65	50	70	57		66					
FRL	51	64	66	63	60	42	48					64

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	34%	54%	-20%	54%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	59%	-8%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	55%	-14%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	59%	-21%	51%	-13%

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.

Fifth grade science showed the lowest growth in the 2022-2023 school year. Trends were evident based on the PMA assessments that affected next steps. Small groups were created in January/February which focused on students underperforming in reading to allow for the use of reading strategies with science content while continuing to provide instruction aligned with the scope and sequence and complete inquiries.

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

Fifth grade science showed the lowest growth in the 2022-2023 school year and the lowest data point over the past 4 years. This year, FBS (intervention time) for 5th grade was used for ELA and later math and ELA. Historically, intervention time was provided to science instruction and reteaching.

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.

Currently, 5th grade science has the greatest gap when compared to the district. This year, FBS (intervention time) for 5th grade was used for ELA and later math and ELA. Historically, intervention time was provided to science instruction, and reteaching.

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

ELA proficiency remained the same as the previous year. There was a focus on small group and student collaboration as well as monitoring and appropriate release to ensure students had the opportunity to practice with feedback prior to the assessment. Additionally, individual and team data chats were conducted consistently to monitor students' movement and identify trends.

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

Two areas of concern are for students performing a level 1 in the content areas of ELA and math based on PM 3.

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

1. Increase reading proficiency from 47% to 55%
2. Increase Math proficiency from 48% to 55%
3. Increase 5th-grade science proficiency from 36% to 55%
4. Continue to use PBIS systems to reduce discipline occurrences resulting in In and Out-of-School suspensions
5. Increase data usage to monitor MTSS, ESE, ELL student proficiency

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.

Spring Lake Elementary will Increase learning gains for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL) in ELA on the PM 3 FAST assessment.

For our 4th grade group last year we had 75% of students identified under SWD, were not proficient in ELA, and 94% of students identified as ELL, were not proficient in ELA.

A similar scenario holds true for last year's 3rd graders; 62% of students identified under SWD were not proficient in ELA, and 90% of students identified as ELL were not proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By identifying students in these subgroups, we will be able to monitor students' performance and conference with teachers and intervention staff to ensure learning gaps are being reduced and students are on the upward trajectory towards proficiency. The goal is for 45% of students in each subgroup to be proficient in ELA on this year's PM3 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be identified in the teachers' data matrix and their proficiency on unit assessments as well as their growth on PM2 will be analyzed and action steps will be taken to address the new results. School-wide data meetings will be held monthly with all staff, however, conversations with coaches and admin will occur in between these meetings to help maintain the focus on these subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aja Wilkins (aja.wilkins@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.)

We will continue to create a system to effectively analyze data, provide opportunities to increase instructional practices for all teachers, make data-driven adjustments that improve student outcomes, and take a proactive stance on student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We selected this strategy because our students with disabilities and English Language Learners, historically, continue to struggle with obtaining proficiency. After teachers of students with disabilities and English Language Learners implement instruction with accommodations, they will monitor student progress and make data-driven adjustments.

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?

Yes

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.

SWD schedule monitored for instructional time of pull-out and push-in support (POPI).

Person Responsible: Aja Wilkins (aja.wilkins@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

SWD data is monitored weekly by teachers as well as by coaches and administrators.

Person Responsible: Aja Wilkins (aja.wilkins@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

SWD curriculum adjusted to reflect data collected for IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Aja Wilkins (aja.wilkins@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

Professional development will be provided to teachers of Students with Disabilities to support instruction with accommodations to improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Aja Wilkins (aja.wilkins@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

#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.

Increases the positive effects of the PBIS school-wide that has been implemented. This year we will include a teacher store for teachers to shop in with tickets they receive for participating in engaging conversations, supporting a peer, attending parent events, etc. increasing the retention of teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school-wide PBIS will continue to reduce the out-of-school suspension and in-school suspensions. Last year Spring Lake had four out-of-school suspensions and ten in-school suspensions, which was a decrease from the 2021-2022 school year. We plan to continue to keep this suspension rate low and support teachers with behavior modification through the PBIS. We will also acknowledge teachers throughout the day in a similar way as students. With this support, the retention rate should increase. In the 2022-23 school year, we had a turnover rate of 23% which includes transfers, retirement, relocation out of state/county, and resigning from education.

Monitoring:

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

Students' suspension rates will be monitored every nine weeks.

Teacher satisfaction in the profession and at Spring Lake will be monitored by a reduction in the turnover rate by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Warkentien (gina.warkentien@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.)

The PBIS will be used across campus and teachers will receive PD on it to ensure that they are equipped with what they need to maintain a positive environment in their classroom. Additionally, school Administrators will intentionally plan days and events for teachers to help them feel supported and appreciated throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When a system is in place and expectations are clear, maladaptive behaviors are decreased and learning opportunities increase.

When staff feels supported and heard they are more apt to stay and grow with the team.

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.

Professional development for staff once every nine weeks and/or as needed.

Person Responsible: Gina Warkentien (gina.warkentien@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Meeting will be conducted with students to reinforce PBIS throughout the day.

Person Responsible: Gina Warkentien (gina.warkentien@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Administrators will be visible throughout the building daily to include but not limited to PLCs.

Person Responsible: Gina Warkentien (gina.warkentien@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Administrators will work with the Sunshine Committee to ensure they have the support needed to promote their cause and efforts to bring the teams together.

Person Responsible: Gina Warkentien (gina.warkentien@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

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 FAC will meet and vote on the allocations. This decision will be brought to SAC to vote as well.

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

Based on the 22-23 ELA PM 3 the area of focus needed for kindergarten is high-frequency words and vocabulary. The need for high-frequency words and vocabulary affects the student's fluency which can

hinder overall reading comprehension.

Based on the 22-23 ELA PM 3 the area of focus needed for first grade is vocabulary and comprehension of informational text. As students interact with informational text, their vocabulary is strengthened, which in turn affects reading comprehension.

Based on the 22-23 ELA PM 3 the area of focus needed for second grade is phonics and vocabulary. The need for vocabulary affects the student's fluency which can hinder overall reading comprehension, while a phonics deficiency will impede decoding, which also affects fluency and comprehension.

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

Based on the 22-23 ELA PM 3 the area of focus needed for third grade is phonics. A phonics deficiency will impede decoding, which also affects fluency and comprehension.

Based on the 22-23 ELA PM 3 the area of focus needed for fourth grade is vocabulary and comprehension of an informational and literary text. As students interact with an informational and literary text, their vocabulary is strengthened, which in turn affects reading comprehension. the area of focus needed for fourth grade is vocabulary and comprehension of informational and literary text. As students interact with an informational and literary text, their vocabulary is strengthened, which in turn affects reading comprehension. the area of focus needed for third grade is phonics. A phonics deficiency will impede decoding, which also affects fluency and comprehension.

Based on the 22-23 ELA PM 3 the area of focus needed for fourth grade is vocabulary and comprehension of an informational and literary text. As students interact with an informational and literary text, their vocabulary is strengthened, which in turn affects reading comprehension.

64% of 3rd graders scored below level 3.

38% of 4th graders scored below level 3.

66% of 4th graders scored below level 3.

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

Kindergarten- 100% of students will be on or above grade level by PM 3.

1st Grade- 75% of students will be on or above grade level by PM 3.

2nd Grade- 75% of students will be on or above grade level by PM 3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd Grade- 60% of students will be on or above grade level by PM 3.

4th Grade- 50% of students will be on or above grade level by PM 3.

5th Grade- 50% of students will be on or above grade level by 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.

ELA growth for kindergarten through 5th grade will be measured with the following ongoing progress monitoring tools: SIPPS Mastery Assessment, school-based classroom walkthroughs, district-supported Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUA), and intervention tools.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wilkins, Aja, aja.wilkins@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?

The programs being implemented that are evidence-based to achieve measurable outcomes include district-created curriculum resource materials (CRMS), and SIPPS.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The programs were chosen because they focus on the foundational skills needed for success. The use of these particular programs has rendered results and therefore, has today been identified to be effective in increasing foundational skills in reading.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Strengthen Foundational Skills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Literacy Leadership will promote foundational skills by planning activities throughout the school year. -Literacy coaching will support teachers in effectively implementing the instruction of foundational skills. -Professional learning will be incorporated to support the needs of the instructional staff throughout the year. -Assessments will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the instruction of foundational skills. 	<p>Plata, Ashley, ashley.plata@ocps.net</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

Spring Lake will have a SAC meeting that is open to all families to review the SIP. The SIP will be revisited in January following PM2 to allow parents to see the movement of growth toward the goals identified in the plan. The SAC meeting date will be posted on Talking Points for all parents to know when the meeting will occur.

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 will be encouraged to utilize PowerPoint Live which allows parents to be included in conversations when an interpreter is not available and another language is spoken.

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)

By increasing data literacy and taking a proactive stance to learning instead of a reactive one, teachers will be prepared to support students as they need each day.

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))

N/A

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No