

Orange County Public Schools

Waterford Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Waterford Elementary

12950 LAKE UNDERHILL RD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://waterfordes.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Danielle Arbelaez Willis

Start Date for this Principal: 10/11/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2019-20 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Waterford Elementary

12950 LAKE UNDERHILL RD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://waterfordes.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	B

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.

With the support of families and community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

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
Arbelaez-Willis, Danielle	Principal	Curriculum Leader, Instructional Support , 1st, 3rd, 5th, Specials, Coaching, Evaluating, Lesson Plans, PLCs Grades/ monitoring, Report Cards, Progress Reports, iObservation, Professional Learning, Bottom 25% monitoring, SELL, SAC, PTO Point Person, Budget, Staff Report, Threat Assessments
Panas, Stephanie	School Counselor	Threat Assessments, Small group social skills support, Child Safety Matters, Health curriculum, Red Ribbon week, Character Ed Program, Character Trait Celebration, Homeless McKinney Vento Coordinator, News Crew, Pantry, SELL team, Interventions
Ebert-Jones, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Curriculum support, Science support, Science fair, STEM night Committee lead, Testing Coordinator (FSA, iReady), iReady Lead , Textbook Coordinator, PD Points, School Calendar, Staff & Parent Newsletter, Instructional Focus Calendar, PLC, Staff Development coordinator, Certification, Portfolios, Interns, Field trips, Fundraisers, Teach-In, Tutoring Coordinator, Skyward Cap, School Committees, Quarterly & EOY Awards Interventions
Moberg, Stacey	Other	Staffing Specialist: ELL Instructional Support, ELL Compliance mtgs (initial/ monitoring/ data), ELL PD-Training /support, ELL Parent Liaison/PLC, Imagine Learning Coordinator, ESE initial eligibility, ESE Annual reviews/re-eval, ESE Team Scheduling/Lead, ESE Program monitoring, ESE Data monitoring, Gifted Eligibility , 504 Compliance, ACCESS/WIDA testing coordinator, Transportation, Interventions
Mills, Christine	Assistant Principal	Principal's Designee, Curriculum Leader, Instructional Support , ESE, Specials , K, 2nd, 4th, ESE, Coaching Evaluating, Lesson Plans, PLCs, Grades/monitoring, Report Cards, Progress Reports , iObservation Facilities/ Custodial, Safe School Plan/ Drills/ SERT lead/ Emergency Mngmt./ Threat Assessments, SIP Attendance, Club/After school activities/ Facilities Rental coordinator, Property Mngr / Furniture Req. Retention Mtgs, MAO Admin, Skyward Cap, Duty Schedule, Master Schedule, Cultural Responsive Plan Good cause/ portfolios, Summer School
Farrow, Deadra	Other	Literacy Committee Lead, Battle of the Books, Literacy Night, Book Fair, Accelerated Reader Lead, DCTL Lead, 5 Star Chair, Fixed Assets/Property manager, Textbooks, Media Center Schedule, Media Center lessons Spelling Bee Liaison, Interventions

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 10/11/2019, Danielle Arbelaez Willis

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.*

1

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2019-20 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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 .	

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	23	100	106	95	124	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	12	20	10	12	23	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 7/8/2020

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	113	107	128	113	135	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	726
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	11	2	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	14	3	6	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	23	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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		1	2	0	1	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	3	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	

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	113	107	128	113	135	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	726
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	11	2	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	14	3	6	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	23	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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		1	2	0	1	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	3	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	

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	65%	57%	57%	67%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	58%	58%	53%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	52%	53%	37%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	63%	63%	70%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	46%	61%	62%	65%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	48%	51%	47%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	56%	53%	62%	50%	51%

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	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
	2018	69%	55%	14%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	78%	61%	17%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	63%	4%	64%	3%
	2018	74%	62%	12%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	58%	57%	1%	60%	-2%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
	2018	47%	53%	-6%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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
SWD	13	36	32	6	24	18	15				
ELL	47	48	35	48	36	19	32				
ASN	90			90							
BLK	63	53		48	20						
HSP	56	54	33	57	45	24	52				
WHT	76	67	46	80	49	25	74				
FRL	53	50	30	53	38	30	41				

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
SWD	13	46	45	31	46	38	17				
ELL	42	54	52	58	63	57	10				
BLK	77	76		65	65		45				
HSP	58	56	54	70	69	61	44				
MUL	70			70							
WHT	75	71	50	80	71	38	61				
FRL	55	58	50	65	69	52	37				

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
SWD	10	23	20	18	36	31	21				
ELL	37	49	50	42	47	39	26				
ASN	64			64							
BLK	51	39		50	48		55				
HSP	63	53	39	65	59	50	49				
MUL	70			80							
WHT	77	57		83	76	50	80				
FRL	52	45	40	56	55	43	50				

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	53
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	49
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
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	62
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	46
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.

2018-2019 - The data components that scored the lowest were 4th grade ELA at 58% and 5th grade Math at 58%. Some of the teachers were new to ELA and Math content and grade level areas. Additional time for extended professional development in their content areas was limited. Based on 2019-2020 BOY to MOY iReady(end of year view), 4th grade ELA proficiency went from 28% to 37%. 5th grade Math went from 16% to 35% proficient.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 3rd grade Math. In 2018 the proficiency rate was 78% and in 2019, the proficiency rate was 64% which indicates a 14% decrease. Factors that contributed to this decline was student readiness and the lack of intense overall focus on ELA. Based on the 19-20 MOY iReady data, 3rd grade Math projected an increase from 2019 FSA data.

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 that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 3rd grade Math. In 2018 the proficiency rate was 78% and in 2019, the proficiency rate was 64% which indicates a 14% decrease. Factors that contributed to this decline was student readiness and the lack of intense overall focus on ELA. Based on the 19-20 MOY iReady data, 3rd grade Math projected an increase from 2019 FSA data. All other areas were showing an increase based on the 19-20 MOY iReady data and there was no decline observed in any grade level and subgroup.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the previous year was 5th grade Science by 10% as the proficiency rate was 65% as compared to 54% in 2018. Actions contributing to this improvement included one teacher, dedicated to planning Science instruction using district provided CRMs and resources and an increase in the monitoring of the PMA and common assessment data.

Based on 19-20 MOY iReady data, the current learning gains for students in Math is 27%. Our intended outcome is to increase the learning gains to 58%, thus surpassing the state average.

Based on 19-20 MOY iReady data, FSA projections were as follows:

ELA - Achievement =72; Learning Gains = 70; Low 25 = 73

Math - Achievement =67; Learning Gains = 61; Low 25 = 56

The 18-19 FSA gains for students with disabilities is 24%. Our intended outcome was to increase the learning gains for our students with disabilities to a minimum of 41%. Based on 19-20 MOY iReady FSA projections - SWD(ESSA group) would have had LGs of 76%.

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

Attendance below 90% and students scoring Level 1 on State assessments.

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

1. Lowest 25% in Math
2. Lowest 25% in ELA
3. Increase proficiency for ESE students
4. Increase overall SEL competencies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: To increase the learning gains for the lowest 30% in ELA and in Math

Measurable Outcome:
 Based on 18-19 FSA data: The current learning gains for students in ELA is 35%. Our intended outcome was to increase the learning gains to 54%, thus surpassing the state average by 1%.
 Based on 19-20 MOY iReady data, the current learning gains for students in Math is 27%. Our intended outcome is to increase the learning gains to 58%, thus surpassing the state average.
 Based on 19-20 MOY iReady data, FSA projections were as follows:
 ELA - Achievement =72; Learning Gains = 70; Low 25 = 73
 Math - Achievement =67; Learning Gains = 61; Low 25 = 56
 The 18-19 FSA gains for students with disabilities is 24%. Our intended outcome was to increase the learning gains for our students with disabilities to a minimum of 41%. Based on 19-20 MOY iReady FSA projections - SWD(ESSA group) would have had LGs of 76%.
 For 20-21, our intended outcome is to increase the learning gains for our students with disabilities to 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
 Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 1. Revamp system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes.
 2. Teachers make content, skills and concepts explicit by showing and telling students what to do or think while solving problems, enacting strategies, completing tasks and classifying concepts.
 3. Build our culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) to increase student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Based on 18-19 FSA data:
 1. Teachers need to study their practice to improve student learning, validate reasoned hypotheses about salient instructional features and enhance instructional decision making.
 2. Teachers need to increase their systematic use of explicit instruction.
 3. In regards to our ESSA group - after Exceptional Student Education teachers develop instructional goals, they evaluate and make ongoing adjustments to students' instructional programs based on student data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to use District Professional Learning Community strategies during ELA instruction.
2. Monitor iReady dashboard
3. Monitor trends in common assessments
4. Weekly Reading and Math tutoring.
5. Teachers will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs and provided actionable feedback as well as Tier 3 teachers provided support through the Coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student academic success will be enriched when students have multiple opportunities to interact with other(students and adults) and create meaningful connections to academic content.
Measurable Outcome:	AdvanceEd Survey - increase by .5% Improvement in our Discipline and Threat data - decrease by 50%(less than 60 referrals for the year) Attendance Data - increase attendance rate by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Panas (stephanie.alden@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through distributive leadership in combination with social-emotional learning opportunities, academic success with be increased for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Collaboration with general education teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff is necessary to support students' learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students' social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct monthly Threat Assessment meetings with TAT/analyze data for trends.
2. Conduct daily check-ins with at-risk students with a designated staff member.
3. Implement school wide Positive Behavior Intervention System to positively impact school climate and culture
4. Design and implement specific professional training opportunities for staff that details how integrating academics and social-emotional learning are essential to student success.

Person Responsible Stephanie Panas (stephanie.alden@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will devote their focus to close the achievement gap for all students and increase proficiency while supporting student SEL.

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.

Waterford Elementary continues to focus on increasing parental involvement and community support. We are doing this by keeping our school website and Facebook page continually updated. We are also keeping our parents informed through Connect Orange and digital newsletters. Teachers use Class Dojo and other forms of communication that keep parents involved in student progress both academically and behaviorally. Open House, Meet the Teacher, PTA meetings and events and the School Advisory Committee (SAC) are also avenues in which Waterford ES communicates and build positive relationships with all stakeholders. Each teacher has also been provided with a grade specific Sanford Harmony Kit to use within in their classroom during the health course as well.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$10,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	1091 - Waterford Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$10,400.00
<i>Notes: Tutoring for ELA and Math</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3610	239-Other	1091 - Waterford Elementary	General Fund		\$1,000.00
<i>Notes: Positive Behavior Incentive supplies</i>						
Total:						\$11,400.00