

Orange County Public Schools

# Water Spring Elementary



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Water Spring Elementary

16000 WATER SPRINGS BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<http://waterspringes.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Matthew Hendricks**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	29%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

**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 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](http://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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Water Spring Elementary

16000 WATER SPRINGS BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<http://waterspringes.ocps.net/>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	%

### School Grades History

Year

Grade

### 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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Klaber, Amy	Principal	
Casamento, Joni	Teacher, K-12	
Kmak, Erica	Teacher, ESE	
Matos, Araceli	Instructional Media	
Soto, Dayanara	Instructional Coach	
Simmerly, Tina	Teacher, ESE	
Roach, Bralin	Teacher, ESE	
Casamento, Joan	Instructional Coach	
Hendricks, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Valentine, Ambia	School Counselor	

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)****Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/13/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	



## 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	0%	57%	57%	0%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	58%	0%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	63%	63%	0%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	61%	62%	0%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	51%	0%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	53%	0%	50%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
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)	0 (0)	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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 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

### 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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

## 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.**

N/A

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

N/A

**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.**

N/A

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

N/A

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

N/A

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

1. Increase number of students making learning gains in ELA & Math High Achieving Students making learning gains in ELA & Math
2. Reduce achievement level gap of SWD
3. Reduce achievement level gap of ELL
4. Ensure students earn high levels of proficiency in ELA, Math and Science

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Ensure that students are achieving proficiency
<b>Rationale</b>	Water Spring Elementary opening in August of 2019. With the creation of our team, staff has come from different schools from around the globe. As a result, one of our focuses is to address students meeting proficiency levels in reading, math and science.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	As a result of staff calibration throughout the 2019-2020 school year, we expect 80% of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade to be at or above achievement level in FSA 2020 ELA and Math Assessment. We also expect 75% of students in 5th grade to score at or above achievement level on the 2020 State Science Assessment.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Amy Klaber (amy.klaber@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Through common planning, our staff will build a culture of positive and supportive collaboration focusing on data analysis, continuous improvement, professional development and planning standards aligned lessons as measured by administrative calibration walks.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Common planning, PLC is a time for staff to discuss data, and ways to improve based on ... We are also able to deconstruct the standard and ensure, through discussions, that our content is aligned to the appropriate level of rigor. We also focus on calibrating and come to a consensus of understanding school expectations, common language, best practices, and positive, collaborative climate as we move toward earning our first school grade of an A.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identifying staff and begin calibration of common planning expectations during pre-planning to include team and staff norms.</li> <li>2. Identifying areas of focus based on initial data collection and analysis.</li> <li>3. Introducing backwards design to teams to focus on the end in mind for lesson planning to outcomes</li> <li>4. Supporting the common planning process by supporting common language, deconstruction of standards, culturally responsive teaching, literacy strategies and ensuring all members of the team have an understanding of the grade level standard.</li> <li>5. Provide ongoing coaching support to help build teacher capacity.</li> <li>6. Monitoring of walk through data, common assessments, district and state data.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Joan Casamento (joan.casamento@ocps.net)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Ensure that students are achieving learning gains
<b>Rationale</b>	Trends from previous feeder schools, student subgroups such as SWD, FRL, ELL, and Gifted show a need for focused differentiation and enrichment to ensure learning gains.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Overall learning gains for ELA will show 70% and math will show 75% according to the 2020 FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Amy Klaber (amy.klaber@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiation and enrichment strategies will be implemented for all students throughout the 90 minute reading block, 60 minute math block in small group instruction. This will also be seen during fluid grouping in Functional Basic Skills times throughout the week.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Learning gains are attached to individual needs. Differentiation of instruction will ensure we are meeting the needs of all learners and not just utilizing a "one-size fits all" model.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administer initial assessments and diagnostics on a school-wide level.</li> <li>2. Support teams with determining intervention and enrichment groups for differentiation.</li> <li>3. Provide professional development focusing on different models of differentiation.</li> <li>4. Provide ongoing coaching support to help build teacher capacity.</li> <li>5. Continue monitoring and adjusting groups based on progress monitoring data.</li> <li>6. Conduct observations and provide feedback to teachers.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matthew Hendricks (matthew.hendricks@ocps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**