Springwood Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Springwood Elementary School

3801 FRED GEORGE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/springwood

Demographics

Principal: Sylvia Myers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/8/2020

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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 Leon 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

The Mission of Springwood Elementary School is to provide all students with a safe, positive and challenging learning environment that enables all learners to become well-prepared, productive and contributing citizens in the 21st century. It is our objective to recognize and develop individuality, self-growth and responsibility using a variety of strategies and cooperative efforts throughout the school, home and community.

Provide the school's vision statement

Dedicated to putting students first, Springwood Elementary School will be known as an award-winning school. Visionary in both plan and accomplishment, Springwood Elementary School will embrace families, volunteers and the community to support its educational programs in a well-maintained, technologically rich facility. Working together with all stakeholders, Springwood Elementary School will provide a loving, compassionate learning community that nurtures and supports exemplary education for every student.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Myers, Sylvia	Principal	The Principal ensures that both the vision and mission of the school are communicated to all stakeholders and provides school wide leadership. The Principal provides support to teachers and staff by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations, and feedback. The Principal works with all stakeholders to provide a positive learning environment that fulfills the academic goals of the school.
Hayes, Sharima	Instructional Coach	The Math Coach provides instructional support to classroom teachers in order to ensure rigorous standards based instruction is occurring. The Math Coach works closely with the leadership team to disaggregate and disseminate data.
DeCardenas, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal provides school wide leadership, coordinates collaborative planning efforts, and facilitates progress monitoring and professional development. The Assistant Principal works intricately with the Principal and Instructional Coaches to help make decisions that impact the school community and student achievement.
Dobie, Brian	Dean	The Dean provides the teachers and students with positive behavioral supports in order to create a positive learning environment in which all students can learn.
Shiver, Randi	Instructional Coach	The Reading Coach provides instructional support to classroom teachers in order to ensure rigorous standards based instruction is occurring. The Reading Coach works closely with the leadership team to disaggregate and disseminate data.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/8/2020, Sylvia Myers

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
39

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	89	85	82	102	80	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	12	5	7	6	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	3	3	6	17	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	0	1	5	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	5	11	3	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 5/24/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	91	88	80	106	80	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	20	12	11	5	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	0	0	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	5	14	1	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - Updated

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	91	88	80	106	80	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	20	12	11	5	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	0	0	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	5	14	1	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	47%	57%	57%	47%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	54%	58%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	47%	53%	37%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	64%	64%	63%	50%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	65%	63%	62%	32%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	45%	51%	14%	40%	47%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	49%	52%	53%	26%	52%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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
03	2019	51%	61%	-10%	58%	-7%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	57%	-11%	58%	-12%
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	41%	56%	-15%	56%	-15%
	2018	39%	57%	-18%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	63%	-3%	62%	-2%
	2018	46%	64%	-18%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	66%	0%	64%	2%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	61%	61%	0%	60%	1%
	2018	39%	58%	-19%	61%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	53%	-4%
	2018	28%	56%	-28%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	21	25	24	34	48	30	30				
BLK	43	41	29	64	66	33	41				
HSP	38			54							
WHT	58	56		67	68		75				
FRL	44	45	30	62	65	31	50				

2018 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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	20	31	26	20	20	9					
BLK	46	50	39	46	29	14	17				
HSP	50			70							
MUL	50			33							
WHT	51	31		63	42		47				
FRL	43	48	37	44	32	15	32				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	65
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Based on the 2019 data, the component that performed the lowest was in Math, lowest 25th percentile (34%). This data point will need to be monitored since there was a decrease from the previous year (2018) (37%) to ensure this does not become a trend. Based on the 2020 STAR data our lowest performance area was ELA proficiency for 3rd grade at 34%.

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

The two areas with that showed the greatest decline from the prior year, 2018 (37%) to 2019 (34%) was ELA, lowest 25th percentile (-3) and ELA learning gains (-3), 2018 (47%) to 2019 (44%).

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

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average in 2019 was ELA, lowest 25th percentile. The school average was 34% and the state average was 53% (-19). We were considerably lower than the district and state averages. The school's Middle of the Year STAR data from 2020 indicated our lowest 25th percentile was at 47% which was closer to the state average in 2019 of 53% which brings the gap to -6 and on par with the district average in 2019 (47%).

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

The data component with the most improvement was Math learning gains in 2019 with a 33 point increase. Springwood used Acaletics and Go Math to improve math scores.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

When reflecting on the EWS data for 2020, an area of concern is the number of 4th graders with with early warning indicators. Of the 80 fourth graders this year, 9 had indicators, roughly 11% of our fourth graders

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

1. Increase the level of ELA achievement (47%) to 55% to be closer in line with the district and state average from 2019.
2. Increase ELA learning gains (44%) to 55% to be in line with the district average of 54% from 2019.
3. Increase the ELA lowest 25th percentile (34%) to be 70%.
4. Increase math lowest 25th percentile (33%) to be 70%.
5. Increase the achievement levels of our SWD as indicated in the federal index.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our proficiency in ELA proficiency in 2019 was 47% which was significantly below the state and district average, 57%.
Measureable Outcome:	Our intended outcome is to raise the proficiency percentage from 47% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to improve school wide reading proficiency, we will provide reading experiences that include remediation and acceleration, while exposing students to books in their area of interest, daily supported independent reading of challenging text, while using differentiated instruction, and interest based choice opportunities in reading. Teachers will utilize both a whole group and small group instructional model that is supported by their on-going data analysis of need. Teachers will also provide Tier II and Tier III reading interventions that are targeted to increase reading proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students need to have the opportunity to work with challenging text in order to build their reading skills repertoire. An enriched reading environment provides the opportunity to work on complex tasks while engaging in higher order thinking skills. Data analysis of the students' standards mastery, will provide teachers with an opportunity to either accelerate, or remediate, their students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teach the Wonders curriculum with fidelity.
2. Use progress monitoring data to differentiate the learning experience
during the intervention/enrichment time.
3. Use iReady diagnostic data to create a plan for instruction and to develop
reading centers.
4. Use data tracking to determine students' acquisition of standards.
5. Provide students with reading passages on their independent and
instructional levels.
6. Provide cognitively complex tasks for all students.
7. Have students to set goals and track their own progress.
8. Develop and use a comprehensive writing plan.

Person Responsible Randi Shiver (shiverr@leonschools.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our data from 2019, ELA learning gains is an area where we demonstrated a decline in percentage points (-3), from 47% to 44%. Although our STAR Middle of the Year data indicated our ELA Learning Gains were at 45%, this area continues to be an area of focus. By improving our learning gains, we will also improve overall ELA proficiency.
Measureable Outcome:	An increase in ELA learning gains from 44% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize collaborative planning to target the learning standards and instructional strategies that are required to complete complex tasks. Wonders formative and summative assessments, AR, STAR, and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions. District developers and the reading coach will provide instructional support and professional development. Teachers will participate in administrative-led data discussions on a monthly basis. These data meetings will focus on effective strategies to put in place to meet the needs of all learners
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing the instructional resources, data, support staff, and collaborative planning time, teachers will be able to develop lessons that are rigorous enough to increase learning gains for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Target and focus on the ELA standards.
2. Identify complex and rigorous instructional material.
3. Provide supplemental lessons that target instructional needs identified by the data.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that targets improving learning gains.
5. Teachers will attend administrative led data discussions on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Randi Shiver (shiverr@leonschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to ELA Lowest 25th Percentile

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At 34% in 2019 we were far below the district average of 47% and the state average of 53% in the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile category. The Middle of the Year Star data for 2020 indicates we were at 47% for our lowest quartile students. Although this is on par with the 2019 district average, this is still an area of focus.
Measureable Outcome:	An increase in the lowest 25% in ELA from 34% to 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Wonders formative and summative assessments, AR, STAR, and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding interventions. Ready Books will be used in small group instruction to support students who require intensive comprehension intervention. These supplemental lessons will be provided by the classroom teacher (in grades 3-5). District developers will be available to provide professional development to teachers who will improve on and develop educational strategies that will help to reach the school's academic goals. Teachers will participate in administrative led data discussions on a monthly basis. These data meetings will focus on effective strategies to put in place to meet the needs of all learners with a focus on those students in the lowest 25%. Teachers will also be responsible for collaboratively planning standards driven, rigorous lessons with their teammates and the reading coach, for each week of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing the resources, data, and planning time, teachers will be able to target students who need intensive interventions. Instructional coaching from the district developers and the school based reading coach will provide the opportunities for teachers to have the professional development and support to make the desired gains. In addition, by identifying targeted students and closely monitoring their progress, we increase learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify the students in the lowest 25% at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to have a learning gain and/or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA standards that students struggled with the most on the FSA and address that gap instructionally.
3. Develop targeted and intensive interventions.
4. Teachers will work closely with the reading coach to develop appropriate and impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible	Randi Shiver (shiverr@leonschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At 33% in 2019 we were still far below the district average of 45% and the state average of 51% in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile category. Our Middle of the year Star data in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile category indicated we were at 35%. This continues to be an area in need of improvement.
Measureable Outcome:	Our intended outcome is to raise the lowest 25% in Math from 33% to 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Acaletics will be taught daily with fidelity in grade 3-5. Go Math summative and formative assessments, STAR Math, and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding interventions. Ready Books will be used in small group instruction to support students with complex cognitive tasks.Supplemental lessons will be taught by the teacher in small groups. District math support will be provided, as well as, access to the math coach to develop educational strategies that target our students in the lowest 25%.Teachers will participate in administrative led data discussions on a monthly basis. Teachers will plan collaboratively to create standards based instruction that meets the needs of our students in the bottom 25%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing the resources, data, and planning time, teachers will be able to target students in the bottom 25% and provide the required intensive interventions. Instructional coaching from the district developers and the school based math coach will provide the opportunities for teachers to have the professional development and support to make the desired gains. In addition, by identifying targeted students and closely monitoring their progress, we increase learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students in the lowest 25% at each grade level (3-5) and
determine the growth necessary to a have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify math standards that students struggled with on the FSA and
address the instructional gap.
3. Develop targeted ad intensive interventions.
4. Teachers will work closely with the math coach to develop appropriate and
impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular
basis.

Person Responsible Sharima Hayes (hayess@leonschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our students with disabilities are below the federal index of 41%, as of 2019, and have been so for two consecutive years. Currently they are at 30% and their target is 41%
Measureable Outcome:	Our intended outcome is to raise the achievement level of our students with disabilities (SWD).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth DeCardenas (decardenase@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments, STAR Math, and iReady data will be used to help drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by the Resource, ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups. District instructional support will be provided by the district curriculum developers, as well as, the math and reading coach at Springwood, in order to develop educational strategies that target our students with disabilities. Resource, ESE, and classroom teachers will participate in administrative led data discussions on a monthly basis and track the progress of their SWDs. Teachers will plan collaboratively to create standards based instruction that meets the needs of our students in the SWD subgroup.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing the resources, data, and planning time, teachers will be able to target students with disabilities and provide the required intensive interventions necessary for academic gains. Instructional coaching from the district developers and the school based coaches will provide the opportunities for teachers to have the professional development and support to make the desired gains. In addition, by identifying targeted students and closely monitoring their progress, we increase learning gains and proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify SWDs at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to a have a learning gain and /or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA and Math standards that students with disabilities struggled with on the FSA and address the instructional gap.
3. Develop targeted ad intensive interventions.
4. ESE, Resource and classroom teachers will work closely with the instructional coaches to develop appropriate and impactful instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible	Randi Shiver (shiverr@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The identified school wide improvement priorities from the needs assessment/ analysis have all been addressed in the areas of focus in 3 A. Each focus area has a targeted process for addressing the needs of our students that include but are not limited to: targeted analysis of data, a team approach to planning instruction, professional development for teachers, support from instructional coaches and district developers, and data disaggregation on a regular basis with administration to determine if targets are being met.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Springwood Elementary will strive to build a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved at all levels of decision making. We will have a parent liaison that will work to make connections with our parents and stakeholders by providing learning opportunities for parents and stakeholders and by maintaining a welcoming and inviting school environment. We will also create a new parent resource room that is accessible for parents with instructional and parenting resources such as books, guides, lists of resources, and videos. In addition, we have a volunteer coordinator who will work to involve more parents in volunteering and mentoring opportunities. We would like to increase our school volunteer hours to to 2500 hours for the 2020-2021 school year. In addition, We have a new business partner liaison who is working with community members to support our positive school culture through new and innovative ways, such as community events. We are also building our PTO program to be a robust and active organization and outreach opportunity for the school. In addition, SAC will work to include more community members and stakeholders to reflect our school and community members.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00