Orange County Public Schools

Washington Shores Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Washington Shores Elementary

944 W LAKE MANN DR, Orlando, FL 32805

https://washingtonshoreses.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Myrlene Jackson Kimble

Start Date for this Principal: 1/2/2007

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
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* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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

Washington Shores Elementary

944 W LAKE MANN DR, Orlando, FL 32805

https://washingtonshoreses.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 KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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 insure 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
	Principal	Mrs. Myrlene Jackson-Kimble, the Principal, is the school-based instructional leader for academic and behavior instruction. She provides the vision for the school to ensure high academic achievement is attained for all students. Mrs. Jackson-Kimble implements and evaluates programs within our school to ensure that the achievement gap is closing among subgroups. As an administrator, she performs classroom observations to manage and support alignment for student learning. Additionally, actionable feedback is provided to the teachers to build capacity with the intent of improving instruction and academic student success. Mrs. Jackson-Kimble holds weekly Professional Learning Community meetings at each grade with members of the leadership team to discuss the intensity of standards-based instruction, Tier I and Tier II interventions along with enrichment lessons for students who are working above grade level. She also ensures professional development is based on the needs of the staff to increase student achievement.
Slaughter, Evangeline	Assistant Principal	Ms. Slaughter, Assistant Principal: Assists the school principal with curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives following the School Improvement Plan. Ms. Slaughter supports teachers in implementing and monitoring effective whole group and small group instruction. She also observes and conducts staff evaluations and provides support to teachers. Ms. Slaughter supervises students during the instructional day while implementing and supporting school-wide behavior initiatives. She monitors the progress of the lowest twenty-five percent of students using the MTSS process. Ms. Slaughter coordinates coaching support for teachers utilizing the leadership team and coordinates professional development for non-instructional staff. She oversees Summer Acceleration Reading Camp. Ms. Slaughter is also an active participant in SAC.
Castillo, Crystal	Reading Coach	Ms. Castillo, Reading Coach: Supports K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the Florida State Standards. She supports school curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as the ELA instructional coach, and provides feedback to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the individual needs of students. Ms. Castillo assists teachers with the implementation of Marzano instructional practices and monitors the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement. Ms. Castillo oversees and monitors the reading assessments and student data. She supports and monitors Professional Learning Communities for ELA. She is a member of the leadership team that utilizes the Positive Behavior Support Program to increase student academic achievement. Ms. Castillo also oversees the leadership team with the completion of the School Improvement Plan and provides professional development regularly to build teacher capacity. Additionally, Ms. Castillo participates in the SAC.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Foust, Kacey	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach provides instructional support to teachers and oversees and participates in common planning for kindergarten through fifth grades. Mrs. Foust also supports teachers in data analysis and planning for differentiated activities, small group instruction, and interventions to increase student learning gains. Mrs. Foust works with teachers through the coaching cycle to improve instructional practices school-wide. Ms. Foust also oversees the leadership team with the completion of the School Improvement Plan to build teacher capacity. Additionally, Mrs. Foust participates in SAC monthly meetings.
Hird, Gregory	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mr. Hird supports teachers by providing research-based intervention strategies and instruction programs. He participates in common planning, coordinates curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, and provides school-wide professional development. Mr. Hird facilitates the TOPS program, Teachers Offering Professional Support, to induct new teachers into the school culture. He assists with the implementation of Marzano Instructional Practices and provides actionable feedback to teachers to promote student learning when using the coaching cycle framework. Mr. Hird oversees the promotion and retention process, all documentation regarding curriculum programs, and participates in the completion of the School Improvement Plan. He oversees State, District, and School assessments. Mr. Hird facilitates all school curriculum nights to support student, parent, and school-community relationships. Mr. Hird is also an active participant in SAC.
Walker, Tjunia	Math Coach	Ms. Walker supports K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the Florida State Standards. She facilitates school curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as a math coach. She conducts curriculum math materials/inventory and coordinates mathematics programs and initiatives. Ms. Walker assists teachers with the implementation of Marzano instructional practices and the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement. Ms. Walker supports and monitors Professional Learning Communities for Math and conducts professional development to build teacher capacity. She is a member of the leadership team that supports the Positive Behavior Support program (PBS). Ms. Walker also assists the leadership team with the completion of the School Improvement Plan. Additionally, she is an active member of SAC.
McMillion, Vanessa	Other	Mrs. McMillion serves as behavior and instructional leader. She supports the K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the Florida State Standards and Next Generation Sunshine Science State Standards. She progress monitors grade-level science content, oversees that appropriate science strategies are being implemented in classrooms as well as monitoring the assessments to ensure that the data reflects improved student learning. Mrs. McMillion also oversees our school-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Supports (PBIS) program to support all students in building positive behavior expectations and habits to achieve high academic achievement.
Williams, Shacaree	Other	Mrs. Williams provides resources to the staff regarding ESE instruction and monitoring the progress of Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals. She works with the staff to provide our ESE students with supports and services in the classroom. Mrs. Williams also collects and analyzes the data for Tier III interventions and works with the leadership and teachers to provide intervention support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/2/2007, Myrlene Jackson Kimble

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

392

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

20

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

20

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	11	61	66	65	52	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346
Attendance below 90 percent	9	25	40	30	22	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	6	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	26	69	64	61	72	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364
Attendance below 90 percent	3	31	28	36	26	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	35	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	2	4	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	26	69	64	61	72	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364
Attendance below 90 percent	3	31	28	36	26	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	35	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	2	4	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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				29%	57%	57%	31%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				42%	58%	58%	50%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	53%	53%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	63%	63%	44%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	61%	62%	52%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	48%	51%	36%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	56%	53%	55%	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	25%	55%	-30%	58%	-33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	27%	57%	-30%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	63%	-19%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	57%	-19%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Washington Shores Elementary used i-Ready Diagnostic as an adaptive assessment to progress monitor students in grades 1-5. This tool provided teachers with actionable insight into individual student needs. The Diagnostic Results below offer a complete picture of students who performed on or above grade level.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30% (15)	17% (10)	25% (16)
	Economically Disadvantaged	30% (15)	17% (10)	25% (16)
	Students With Disabilities	17% (1)	33% (2)	33% (2)
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20% (9)	6% (3)	29% (18)
	Economically Disadvantaged	20% (9)	6% (3)	29% (18)
	Students With Disabilities	17% (1)	0	50% (3)
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19% (9)	14% (8)	32% (19)
	Economically Disadvantaged	19% (9)	14% (8)	32% (19)
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	25% (1)	100% (4)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10% (5)	9% (2)	19% (11)
	Economically Disadvantaged	10% (5)	9% (2)	19% (11)
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	25% (1)	50% (2)

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32% (13)	45%(20)	56%(28)
	Economically Disadvantaged	32% (13)	45%(20)	56%(28)
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	40% (2)	20% (1)	40% (2)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8% (3)	27% (12)	42% (21)
	Economically Disadvantaged	8% (3)	27% (12)	42% (21)
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	20% (1)	20% (1)	0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19% (12)	17% (13)	27% (30)
	Economically Disadvantaged	19% (12)	17% (13)	27% (30)
	Students With Disabilities	8% (1)	0	8% (1)
	English Language Learners	11% (1)	0	22% (2)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4% (2)	13% (9)	30% (23)
	Economically Disadvantaged	4% (2)	13% (9)	30% (23)
	Students With Disabilities	0	8% (1)	8% (1)
	English Language Learners	0	0	22% (2)

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17% (9)	23% (15)	28% (19)
	Economically Disadvantaged	17% (9)	23% (15)	28% (19)
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	13% (1)
	English Language Learners	20% (1)	0	20% (1)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20% (10)	15% (4)	37% (23)
	Economically Disadvantaged	20% (10)	15% (4)	37% (23)
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	26% (2)
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43% (23)	37% (21)	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43% (23)	37% (21)	35%
	Students With Disabilities	2% (1)	5% (2)	9% (3)
	English Language Learners	0	0	3% (1)

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	23		12	17						
ELL	6			6							
BLK	23	29	28	33	16	20	38				
HSP	33			8							
FRL	23	29	29	29	20	23	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		20	30	24	32						
ELL	35	42	45	42	48	36	45				
BLK	27	42	53	49	52	45	43				
HSP	35	47		35	40						
FRL	27	40	49	47	52	42	37				

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	5	43		27	36						
ELL	26	44		52	50						
BLK	31	50	55	46	53	39	56				
HSP	25	42		19	42						
FRL	30	48	50	43	49	30	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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
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	21
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
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?

School Grade Component

2018 2019 2021
ELA Achievement 31 29 25
ELA Learning Gains 50 42 28
ELA Lowest 25 53 52 26
Math Achievement 44 48 30
Math Learning Gains 52 51 17
Lowest 25 36 43 19
Science 53 41 33

Based on the FSA data above, there has been a decline in student proficiency in grades 3-5. The trend data in reading and math indicate there is a need to deepen teacher capacity in core instruction. According to the 2020-2021 FSA Reading scores, 39% of students scored a level 3 or higher in 3rd grade.12% of students in 4th grade scored a level 3 or higher, and 24% of students in 5th-grade scored a level 3 or higher. 12% of these students were ESE and only one of them scored a level 3 or higher. 12% of the students in grades 3-5 were ELL students. Of that 12%, there were no students who scored at the proficiency level. The overall school proficiency rate for Math is 30%. Based on the 2020-2021 FSA Math scores, 3rd grade had 47% of students score at level 3 or higher, 4th grade had 18% of students score at level 3 or higher, and 5th grade had 25 % of students score at level 3 or higher.

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

The data component based on progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments demonstrate the greatest need for improvement is in our math performance. According to the available data, we were projecting 46% overall proficiency, a reduction of 2%. However, only 32% of our students in grades 3-5 were proficient in the 2021 FSA Math. This indicates a steady decline in FSA math performance over the past four years.

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

One of the major factors that contribute to this trend is the lack of a solid foundation in number sense and problem-solving. The data also indicates there is a need to deepen teacher capacity in core instruction. Based on our internal reflections, it is apparent that the foci for teachers and coaches during common planning sessions must turn to more effective planning around both pedagogy and monitoring for the desired effect. Additionally, the leadership team grade level contacts will continue the conversation of looking at individual student progress to keep the intervention groups fluid. Interventionists will play an integral part in collecting data as they provide and discuss data from their work with students.

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

When comparing our 2019 and 2021 NGSSS Science scores, 41% to 32% respectively, a negative change of 9% was revealed. With this in mind, the data component showed the most improvement overall was in science achievement. Based on our ongoing Big Idea and PMAs, our students

consistently performed in the '40s. We will continue to utilize all available data to monitor fifth-grade students' performance in science.

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

The growth in science was a direct result of increased classroom support by the Science Coach. The additional support introduced was side-by-side coaching utilizing both the science coach and the curriculum resource teacher during PLCs. Both resource teachers provided small group instruction, hands-on experiments, and academic notebooks.

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

Strategies that will be implemented to accelerate student learning in math are fluency, academic vocabulary activities, and explicit instruction targeting prerequisite skills which are needed to support the core instruction. Students will also solve real-world math problems & justify solutions during the math block. Additionally, students will learn to produce written responses to HOT questions.

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.

The professional development opportunities will be provided in SEL strategies to support teachers and leaders to accelerate learning. Engagement strategies will be embedded during all professional development sessions.

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

The gradual release model embedded with the Concrete Representational Abstract instructional approach will be utilized to help students process information and glean a conceptual understanding of math skills. Interventionists will pull material from the i-Ready toolbox and the Go Math series. Reflex math will also be used to differentiate learning for targeted students to develop math fluency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement dropped in math from 48% to 30% (-18) and also in math learning gains from 51% to 17% (-34%).
Measurable Outcome:	Measurable Outcome: Math proficiency will increase from 30% to 46% (+16). Math learning gains will increase from 17% to 50% (+33). Math learning gains for the lowest 25% of students will increase from 19% to 51% (+32).
Monitoring:	To close achievement gaps for students in subgroups and in the lowest quartile, teachers will incorporate the concrete representational abstract and gradual models. Students in the lowest quartile will receive small group instruction daily with the classroom teacher and/or the interventionist. Weekly data points will be gathered to support the MTSS process and to monitor student growth. Additionally, assessment results will be used to drive instruction and conversations through weekly grade-level PLC meetings. The leadership team will have a continual focus on supporting data as this is an ongoing item on the weekly team leader meeting agenda.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use small group instruction and monitor through classroom walkthroughs and common assessment data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction allows for instructors to provide intimate, differentiated, and focused standards-based instruction to increase overall achievement and learning gains. This year we performed the lowest in Math Learning Gains and the Lowest 25th Percentile. 17% of students scored level 3 or higher while only 19% scored level 3 or higher in the Lowest 25th Percentile. In the previous year, Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile was also an area of low performance. In both of these areas, the school team is working to strengthen differentiated instruction and interventions to target some of the subgroups that make up our Lowest 25th Percentile, such as our students with disabilities and our ELL students.

Action Steps to Implement	
1. Analyze data to group students with similar needs	
Person Responsible	Kacey Foust (kacey.foust@ocps.net)
2. Establish high priority, clearly defined skills and goals for student groups	
Person Responsible	Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)
3. Identify appropriate research-based resources to target students' needs through explicit instruction and interventions	
Person Responsible	Kacey Foust (kacey.foust@ocps.net)
4. Monitor students' progress and the narrowing of achievement gaps through frequent formative	

Person Responsible	Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

5. Utilize data to assess the effectiveness and adjust instruction as needed

Person Responsible	Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 71% of students at Washington Shores Elementary scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). Currently, the overall school proficiency rate for ELA is 25%.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 25 percentage points from 25% to 50%. ELA learning gains will increase from 28% to 50% (+22). ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% of students will increase from 26% to 51% (+25).
Monitoring:	Students will be monitored on a daily basis through the use of summative and/or formative assessments such as teacher observations, running records, exit slips, data points, unit assessments, i-Ready diagnostic, and standards-based item analysis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use small group differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will intentionally plan for differentiated instruction for students' specific needs. This will also provide students with opportunities to receive immediate and corrective feedback.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will attend regular district training to strengthen our understanding of close reading and the effective implementation of academic discussions (SEL team)
2. Establish a school-based plan to support cycles of professional learning
3. Provide professional development to the staff and open up classroom practice to increase pedagogical expertise and build collective efficacy

Person Responsible Gregory Hird (gregory.hird@ocps.net)

1. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted regularly to provide ELA feedback. Adjustments will be made in common planning/PLCs as needed
2. PLCs will have an intense focus on critical standards to ensure lessons are strategically aligned
3. The standards-based unit assessments data will be used in PLCs to inform instructional decisions

Person Responsible Crystal Castillo (crystal.castillo@ocps.net)

1. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted in order to provide immediate feedback to teachers during classroom instruction
2. Monitor and ensure the 90-minute reading block contains statutory requirements.
3. Daily inclusion of on-level whole group instruction, and differentiated small group instruction
4. Acceleration lessons will occur each day during the extra hour to aid students in being successful during core instruction
5. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence.
6. 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.

Person Responsible Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

The MTSS Problem Solving Teams will meet regularly to ensure:

1. Students are appropriately identified.
2. Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity.
3. 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 Shacaree Williams (shacaree.williams@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.

According to the school safety dashboard, Washington Shores Elementary School ranked 1,152 out of 1,395 other elementary schools in the state of Florida. When compared to other schools with the same zip code, Washington Shores Elementary ranks 7 out of 8. Our school is located predominantly in a black neighborhood on Orlando's southwest side. We take pride in our community and are working towards building self-efficacy in our students to improve the community. To change the culture of our community and create a positive climate and safe environment, we are implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). This program is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. Students will learn strategies to self-monitor and regulate their behavior while creating a safe environment where all students can succeed.

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.

To establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of

social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

We are working to increase the number of parents, families, and community stakeholders who participate in campus events. To improve system practices and engage our community, we conducted the Cognia survey then reviewed the final results with our School Advisory Council. We will use the results to bridge the responsibility of student learning with parents, teachers, and community partners. Research says that when parents are engaged in their children's school lives, students have the home support and knowledge they need to finish their assignments and develop a lifelong love of learning. This includes problem-solving skills and intergender communication and understanding, as well as embracing diversity. This school year, Washington Shores Elementary will provide interactive lessons using the Second Step program. These lessons will help students recognize and appreciate one another's similarities and differences while promoting a community
environment in and outside of the classroom. We are also implementing PBIS to teach strategies that will help students self-monitor their behaviors. A ROARS behavioral flowchart was developed to provide a common language throughout the school to support teachers with decision-making when dealing with behaviors. Clerical staff will be assigned grade levels to call parents of students who are absent/tardy each day. Bi-quarterly incentives for attendance will be implemented (i.e. ticket system, brag board, etc.) Additionally, to increase the rate of attendance so that more families are involved in displaying support of the school, we are sending out messages using School Messenger, FACEBOOK, Class Dojo, and school newsletters. Invitations will be extended to stakeholders to continue participating in events such as Meet the Teacher, Open House, the School Advisory Council (SAC), report card conferences, and school curriculum nights.