

Orange County Public Schools

Waterbridge Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Waterbridge Elementary

11100 GALVIN DR, Orlando, FL 32837

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

Demographics

Principal: Arsha Dock R

Start Date for this Principal: 5/26/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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	
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Waterbridge Elementary

11100 GALVIN DR, Orlando, FL 32837

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	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 the 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dock, Arsha	Principal	The principal supervises the daily operations of the school. She provides a safe learning environment, monitors all student data, and ensures implementation of best instructional practices and pedagogy. The principal also monitors instruction and data and provides effective and timely feedback for improving classroom instruction, while monitoring the effectiveness of MTSS, ELL, and ESE strategies and support.
Hambrick, Alisa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will help the principal with supervising the daily operations of the school. She will also provide a safe learning environment, monitor all student data, and ensure implementation of best instructional practices and pedagogy. The assistant principal also monitors instruction and data and provides effective and timely feedback for improving classroom instruction, while monitoring the effectiveness of MTSS, ELL, and ESE strategies and support.
Perry, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will provide on-going professional development and feedback, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to pedagogy and instruction.
Karim, Jennifer	Other	The resource teacher provides instructional support for all teachers through training, coaching cycles and peer teaching. The resource teacher also assists teachers with the MTSS process and tracking student's progress and data.
Olmo, Darlene	Other	The staffing specialist is responsible for staffing students who need additional academic support based on their cognitive or social emotional abilities. She helps to provide intervention for those students who may need to be evaluated and placed in a specific program to get additional support for their academic or behavior needs. She conducts staff meetings and monitors compliance of the ESE process and documents for all ESE students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 5/26/2021, Arsha Dock R

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.*

5

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

629

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

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

5

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	72	90	105	112	110	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	2	17	13	16	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 7/28/2021

2020-21 - 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	32	113	111	109	134	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	5	22	31	16	19	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	6	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	2	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - 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	32	113	111	109	134	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	5	22	31	16	19	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	6	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	2	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	57%	57%	52%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	58%	58%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	52%	53%	57%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	63%	63%	60%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	61%	62%	65%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	48%	51%	54%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	56%	53%	52%	55%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	63%	-12%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool used for the 2020-21 school year to monitor ELA and Math was the iReady diagnostic. The progress monitoring tool used for Science was our district level PMAs.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	34%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	24	43
	Students With Disabilities	11	11	33
	English Language Learners	26	20	35
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	44%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	31	48
	Students With Disabilities	11	22	22
	English Language Learners	13	30	32

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30%	43%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	34	35
	Students With Disabilities	13	38	25
	English Language Learners	9	21	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	25%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	12	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	38
	English Language Learners	7	11	26
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	42%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	24	32
	Students With Disabilities	14	14	14
	English Language Learners	5	11	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11%	24%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	6	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	2	5	23

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	38%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	18	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	0
	English Language Learners	13	21	18
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17%	28%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	8	14
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	4	13	13
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	35%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	19	22
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	6	11	16
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32%	39%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	20	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	13
	English Language Learners	24	13	26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	38	44	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	49	40
	Students With Disabilities	11	13	11
	English Language Learners	29	28	30

Subgroup Data Review

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				4							
ELL	33	53	59	34	39	36	32				
ASN	80			50							
BLK	29	53		19	27		31				
HSP	45	56	50	43	43	41	41				
WHT	48	73		67	67		64				
FRL	39	43		34	39	33	36				
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	12	20	24	17	34	33	8				
ELL	48	54	54	57	51	39	41				
ASN	67	75		83	71						
BLK	39	51	50	35	54	58	25				
HSP	49	50	51	57	51	36	50				
MUL	86	63		82	56						
WHT	64	62	30	72	61		50				
FRL	48	52	59	52	51	44	45				
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	12	42	44	15	29	33					
ELL	38	57	63	51	63	55	39				
ASN	69	53		76	65		80				
BLK	44	45	40	48	44	17	47				
HSP	50	58	60	59	67	59	48				
MUL	78	50		56	58						
WHT	57	59	58	67	67		64				
FRL	52	57	57	60	65	54	52				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	65
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

A trend across grade levels is the decrease in overall 4th grade scores in both ELA and Math proficiency as compared to the other grade levels (3rd and 5th during the 2020-21 school year). 4th grade proficiency in ELA was 38% and 28% in Math. 4th grade also had the highest amount of level 1s in both ELA and Math. Level 1 totals were: ELA: 40 and Math: 52.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components that represents the greatest need of improvement is: Math proficiency, learning gains of the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math, learning gains, lowest 25% and proficiency for students with disabilities.

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

The contributing factors to these needs of improvement includes but is not limited to: several instructional staff changes throughout the year, distance and online learning within a hybrid model, lack of teacher efficacy and knowledge as it pertains to instructing students through the use of multiple technological modalities, lack of effective small group instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The area that showed the most improvement was ELA proficiency/achievement with an increase of 1% and was up by 3% during the 2021 FSA.

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

The contributing factors was an increase and focus on best practices in ELA such as close reading and implementing text dependent questioning strategies.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will offer before school acceleration in grades 3-5 and also provide acceleration to students during the enrichment block for ELA and Math.

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 that will be providing tutoring will receive professional development in our district's MAO (minority achievement office) model for acceleration. All teachers will receive on going professional development in intervention and enrichment programs and resources/materials.

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

Teachers will continue to receive professional development and follow up trainings in areas of need and focus. Administration will continue to implement the FCIM model (plan, do, check, act) to monitor instruction and make adjustments when needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus	Description: Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally.
Description and Rationale:	Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
Measurable Outcome:	Panorama survey data Student Survey - School Climate, Sense of Belonging Teachers and Staff - School Climate, School Leadership, Professional Learning About SEL Family Members - Barriers to Engagement, School Climate Culture & Climate Continuum data DESSA data
Monitoring:	Culture & Climate Continuum data Classroom Walkthrough trend data Qualitative data from students, staff, and families
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum (Caring School Community)
 Ensure a school team receives training on implementation of a school-wide SEL curriculum
 Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum
 Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum

Person Responsible Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Integrating Aligned Instructional and SEL Strategies
 Identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction
 Determine cognitive and conative strategies that align with the standard
 Interpret standards and student needs to intentionally integrate aligned instructional strategies

Person Responsible Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Deliberate School SEL Supports for Families

Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to Engagement that relates to strengthening communication, building community and creating connections such as:

Strengthening Communication

Create and facilitate opportunities to welcome families and introduce key staff (back to school night, Open House, principal breakfast)

Develop a school-wide digital communication outreach plan to inform students and families of how they can connect to the school events and resources

Person Responsible Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our area of focus is on accelerating student performance and increasing student academic growth and learning gains in Math. In 2019 the Math lowest 25th percentile component showed the greatest gap. Likewise all areas in 2021 for Math learning gains, learning gains of the lowest 25%, and math proficiency was also the lowest areas of improvement.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of this area of focus, proficiency in Math will increase by 15%, learning gains will increase by 12%, and learning gains of the lowest 25% will increase by 10%.

Monitoring: We will monitor this area of focus by incorporating monthly data reviews with all teachers and adjusting and accelerating instruction when needed and possible.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Will continue to analyze data, monitor instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that will improve student outcomes. Students will interact in small group instruction and utilize effective cognitive and conative skills necessary for collaboration to practice and deepen knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Streamlining data collection will help identify targeted students and determine the most effective high-yield instructional strategies needed to increase student achievement. Students use of cognitive and conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

Collecting and monitoring student data with fidelity, Determine the effectiveness of tiered instruction, strengthen the intervention block, including the use of the acceleration model, conduct data chats with all teachers, and monitor for standards-based instruction

Person Responsible Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that (50% or more) 60% 3rd grade; 62% 4th grade; and 54% 5th grade; scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).

Measurable Outcome:

The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 6% percentage points from 44% to 50%.

Monitoring:

i-Ready Diagnostics
i-Ready Growth Monitoring
Classroom Walkthroughs
District Standards Based Unit Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence. Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. This instructional practice has a moderate level of evidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This selected instructional practice(s) has a strong and moderate level of evidence. These strategies were selected because the evidence-based practices address the identified need and has shown a proven record of effectiveness for our target population.

Action Steps to Implement

Strengthen the common planning process. Use the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions include foundational planning in K-2

Person Responsible

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Ensure the 90 minute reading block contains statutory requirements. 6 components of reading, daily inclusion of on-level whole group instruction, and differentiated small group instruction

Person Responsible

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure:

Students are appropriately identified.

Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity.

Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.

Person Responsible

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Target our ESSA subgroup (Students with disabilities) by providing opportunities for re-teach, remediation, and intervention and ensure that all IEP and 504 accommodations are provided and followed appropriately.

Person Responsible Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

During the 2019-20 school year, our school reported 1.4 incidents per 100 students when compared to all elementary school statewide which falls into the high category based on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org criteria. This data is comprised of outside school incidents that involves our community and not necessarily our students. Our suspension data was also very low and indicated that we had less than 10 suspensions reported that year. However, our primary focus on discipline for the 2021-22 school year is to continue to decrease or level 1 and level 2 infractions. We will do so by monitoring teacher's implementation of our school wide behavior positive behavior plan (PBS).

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, our school participates in ongoing, district-wide professional development on social and emotional learning. Instructional leaders participate in professional development to monitor and support teaching and learning, to ensure student success. Through a distributive leadership model, our school uses social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success. Through professional development, our school will address the CASEL 5 competencies by implementing the 'Caring School Communities' curriculum as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and cognitive strategies to support student success. Our instructional leadership team, which includes our school guidance counselor, attends district-wide professional development throughout the year. The team collaborates with instructional personnel and provides professional development, based on school and community needs. During School Advisory

Council (SAC) meetings, stakeholders reflect on implementation of academic and social emotional learning, to provide input on next steps.

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

The following Stakeholders are responsible for helping to promote a positive culture and environment by ensuring that all staff members receive effective SELL training, strategies, and implementation.

Dr. Arsha Dock, Principal
 Ms. Alisa Hambrick, Assistant Principal
 Ms. Jennifer Karim-Resource Teacher
 Ms. Tiffany Perry-Instructional Coach
 Ms. Darlene Olmo-Staffing Specialist
 Ms. Carol Swanburg-Guidance Counselor
 Ms. Megan Roy-3rd grade teacher & SELL team member
 Ms. Lindsey Albertson-ESE teacher & SELL team member
 Ms. Jennifer Knippenberg-1st grade teacher & SELL team member

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00