Spring Lake Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spring Lake Elementary

1105 SARAH LEE LN, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://springlakees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Aja Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2022

2019-20 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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (44%) 2020-21: (49%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part 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

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	Principal	Oversees all instructional programs, and classroom instruction. Coaches teachers and reading PLCs. Skyward Lead, master scheduling, SELL Team lead(social emotional learning initiative). SAC committee, School Improvement Plan, Professional Development presenter
Warkentien, Gina	Assistant Principal	Oversees all instructional programs, and classroom instruction. Coaches teachers and reading PLCs. Skyward Lead, master scheduling, SELL Team lead(social emotional learning initiative). SAC committee, School Improvement Plan, Professional Development presenter
Plata, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Lead ELA PLCs for our faculty, and ensure that all Reading plans are on standard and rigorous. Instructional Coach, and head of the Reading Committee. Ms. Plata also monitors classroom instruction and gives feedback to our instructional staff. In addition, she is our Lead Mentor.
Huntzinger, Stacy	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Huntzinger oversees our ELL students, and their instructional needs. She ensures that all testing and paperwork for our ELLs is complete and in compliance. In addition, Ms. Huntzinger leads our MTSS program, holding meetings and providing guidance to those teachers with students in Tiers 2 and 3. She also oversees our bilingual paras, and makes their schedule. Title One paperwork is an additional duty that falls to Ms. Huntzinger.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/27/2022, Aja Wilkins

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

434

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

21

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	57	60	76	73	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/14/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	24	64	60	98	56	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	11	22	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	24	64	60	98	56	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	11	22	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	47%	57%	56%	55%			55%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	62%	61%	56%			67%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	20%	50%	52%	67%			70%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	61%	60%	48%			62%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	53%	66%	64%	41%			60%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	56%	55%	35%			48%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	56%	51%	42%			53%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	63%	7%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	20	17	19	21	39	44	24				
ELL	33	39	18	40	53	47	41				
HSP	41	40	20	48	56	52	52				
WHT	69	43		65	57		57				
FRL	44	35	11	54	55	42	45				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	32	55		29	73						
ELL	44	60	73	40	42	36	34				
HSP	51	60	71	49	48	44	43				
WHT	71	50		51	29		44				
FRL	53	58	67	44	37	38	40				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	19	52	54	19	43	40	8				
ELL	37	63	78	54	63	54	45				
BLK	58			42							
HSP	46	67	76	58	63	51	43				
WHT	69	65	50	70	57		66				
FRL	51	64	66	63	60	42	48				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends across grade levels, subgroups of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, and core content areas continue to show steady growth in the area of Mathematics. Mathematics proficiency and learning gains both increased during the 2022 school year. There was a slight drop in learning gains within the lowest 25% group at 2%. ELA trends show low achievement in reading proficiency. There was an 8% decline from 2019-2020 school year in comparison to the 2021-2022 school year. ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest 25% have also seen a steady decline in the past three years and remain a focus of attention entering the new school year. Tier I ELA Instruction across all grade levels shows signs for improvement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are proficiency in reading. According to the i-Ready End of Year progress monitoring data, there is a low academic achievement in reading across all grade levels. This is also exemplified in the 2022 state assessments with an 8% drop of ELA proficiency. Students' needs historically have not been fully met through differentiating instruction. The learning gaps in reading proficiency get wider as students advance through the grade levels. Therefore, instruction needs to be rigorous and explicit. Teachers must have higher expectations for all students, including our ESE and ELL students while scaffolding to meet their language and ability needs. This also means their needs to be a consistent Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process and structure being adhered to so that students receive consistent and appropriately paced interventions.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

A contributing factor is the absence of interventions being done with fidelity and monitored with fidelity. The structure of MTSS must be surrounded by the use of data to problem solve and intervene when necessary.

Another contributing factor is the need to improve our small group instruction based on decisions made

from data. We also need to continue to expand the focus from just 3-5 to include K-5 in supporting foundations and strengthening Tier 1 block with high expectations for student learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on progress monitoring from Symphony Math, i-Ready, and the 2022 state assessments we have shown a slight decline in Mathematics. Math achievement dropped 10% during the 2021-2022 school year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

There is significant progress being made in Mathematics. We focused on the regular use of Symphony Math which is differentiated with a targeted learning path. Students were also engaged in school-wide fact fluency competitions and were supported with reteaching math content during Foundational Basic Skills (FBS). We want to continue focusing on Math FBS and support differentiated small group instruction during the Math block.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Data based decision-making will be used to determine where students are performing to design and implement lessons to accelerate the MTSS process. Teachers will accelerate students through small group instruction in all content areas to address needs and support explicit instruction in gap areas. Acceleration will help students interact with upcoming benchmarks through small group instruction. Tier 1 teachers will support in this process by providing support during FBS and as an additional teacher group for small group in the core.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will receive professional development in small group instruction, resources, acceleration strategies, and the MTSS process, and how to meet the needs of ESE, 504, and ELL students. Teachers will receive professional development on the new B.E.S.T K-2 standards, the Wonders reading curriculum, LLI, SIPPS, Guided Reading, and Engagement Strategies. We will also continue with common planning twice a week to ensure we are being proactive to match the instructional strategy that will meet our students' needs.Common planning with data components will happen after every assessment so that we may regroup students as needed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Services will include actionable feedback to teachers via classroom walkthroughs and observations, coaching, new teacher training, Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), interventionist training, and paraprofessional support.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our latest school grade calculation reflects growth and an upward trend in all areas except ELA.Our lowest 25% in ELA dropped 47% between 2021 and 2022 school year. In addition, our only ESSA subgroup not to make progress was our students with disabilities group. This group is largely the makeup of our lowest 25%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	In 2022, 20% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA. In 2022, we expect at least 55% of our lowest 25% to make learning gains in ELA.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor our i-Ready diagnostics closely, to ensure that students are making growth in ELA from the Beginning of Year assessment, to mid, and then at the end of the year. We will also use the Progress Monitoring checks and Curriculum Assessments to monitor our lowest 25% in ELA in addition to our ESE and ELL subgroups monthly to prevent the expansion of learning gaps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina Warkentien (gina.warkentien@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teach students in our lowest 25%, and any other non-readers in intermediate grades to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words using the SIPPS program in Tier II and Tier III instruction as well as FBS and through explicit instruction in core small group as foundational skills in grades K-2.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The strategy above was selected because there is strong evidence to support the fact that teaching students to decode, analyze word parts, and practice fluency builds strong foundations and supports students in becoming fluent readers. Additionally, as students fluency increases, the ability to engage in the depths of the benchmarks and curriculum will also increase.

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

1. Common planning on instructional strategies that can be incorporated into all curriculum areas.
2. Professional development on Wonders, Guided Reading, and new B.E.S.T K-5 standards & benchmarks, and deconstructing of standards to ensure questioning goes deeper into what the standard is and what it is not. Use of vertical alignment of standards across all curricular areas.
3. Classroom walks to look for the transfer of instruction with individual feedback provided with coaching cycles implemented as needed.
4. Intervention teachers to provide small group instruction throughout all grades and classrooms.
5. Monitoring the support facilitation model of instruction for the ESE students receiving this service to

ensure it is implemented effectively.

6. Monitoring of data using i-Ready Diagnostics, Curriculum Resource Material (CRM), and Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA's).

7. Conduct individual teacher data meetings to be held.

8. Ensure teachers are providing a print-rich environment for ELL students.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Spring Lake Elementary will Increase learning gains for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in ELA. Learning gains did not increase in the subgroup for Students with Disabilities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	In 2023, Students with Disabilities will increase learning gains by 10 percentage points, creating and monitoring the procedures to analyze data by subgroup and scaffold instructional practices. We will monitor instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs weekly.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Create a system to analyze data, and instructional practices, and make data-driven adjustments that improve student outcomes. Weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to identify trend data in teaching and learning. Monthly data PLC's will occur in which teachers will report on student proficiency, subgroups, and next steps made based on data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina Warkentien (gina.warkentien@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Build a system to analyze data, instructional practices, and make data-driven adjustments that improve student outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	We selected this strategy because our students with disabilities and similar groups such as those designated as 504 continue to struggle with learning gains in all areas. After teachers of students with disabilities implement instruction with accommodations, they will monitor student progress and make data-driven adjustments.

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

1. Exceptional Studnet Education (ESE) schedule monitored for ESE instructional time of Pull-out and Push-in support (POPI).
2. ESE student data is monitored weekly by teachers of SWD as with coaches and admin.
3. ESE students' curriculum adjusted to reflect data collected for IEP goals.
4. Professional development will be provided to teachers of Students with Disabilities to support instruction with accommodations to improve student outcomes.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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 21-22 i-Ready ELA End of Year assessment 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 21-22 i-Ready ELA End of Year assessment 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 21-22 i-Ready ELA End of Year assessment 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.

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. (Red and yellow)
K-21%
1- 42%
2- 57%
3- 34%

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

Based on the 21-22 i-Ready ELA End of Year assessment 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 21-22 i-Ready ELA End of Year assessment 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.

Based on the 21-22 i-Ready ELA End of Year assessment the area of focus needed for fifth grade is vocabulary and Comprehension of Informational Text. The need for vocabulary affects the student's fluency which can hinder overall reading comprehension.
3-34%
4-64%
5-70%

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

Kindergarten- 100% of students will be on or above grade level on the end-of-year assessment for i-Ready.
1st Grade- 75% of students will be on or above grade level on the end-of- year assessment for i-Ready.
2nd Grade- 75% of students will be on or above grade level on the end-of- year assessment for i-Ready.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3rd Grade- 60% of students will be on or above grade level on the end-of-year assessment for i-Ready.
4th Grade- 50% of students will be on or above grade level on the end-of- year assessment for i-Ready.
5th Grade- 50% of students will be on or above grade level on the end-of- year assessment for i-Ready.

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

ELA Growth for Kindergarten-5th grades 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 District supported K-2 Foundational Unit Assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wilkins, Aja, aja.wilkins@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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. Â§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 a measurable outcomes include district created curriculum resource materials (CRM'S), and SIPPS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 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 therefor, 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
Strengthen Foundational Skills: -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.	Wilkins, Aja, aja.wilkins@ocps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Spring Lake Elementary culture and environment will be monitored via the lens of behavior or discipline data with a School-wide Plan for Expectations. Our students' families will play an important role in the success of this
plan. Students will be taught to put school-wide guidelines into action (i.e., classroom chill zones, visual expectations reminders throughout campus, ownership of their respective house values, and responsible behavior in common areas, as these are less structured environments.) We will keep parents informed of student responsibility via dojo, newsletters, and phone/all calls. The importance of teaching and re-teaching the expectations will remain ongoing throughout the school year, with character education, classroom and campus lessons, small group social skills training, Dean and SRO quarterly review of the Code of Student Conduct, and social emotional reminders and tips on morning announcements.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Staff- Staff will set and clearly define behavior expectations, and also explicitly teach and model those expectations.
Students- follow schoolwide expectations and the Code of Conduct consistently. Work collaboratively with your House members to earn points for positive behavior and work ethic.
Parents and Guardians- support and reinforce the Code of Conduct and Behavior expectations laid out for your child. Stay in communication with staff to keep students on the right path.