Water Spring Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Water Spring Elementary

16000 WATER SPRINGS BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

http://watersprings.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Hendricks

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

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)	29%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
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

Water Spring Elementary

16000 WATER SPRINGS BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

http://watersprings.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	21%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21
Grade	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create an 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
Klaber, Amy	Principal	Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems.
Hendricks, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems under the direction of the principal
Matos, Araceli	ELL Compliance Specialist	Update and maintain ELL student electronic records in the OCPS data system. monitoring tool in order to meet compliance requirements during school visits. Provide instructional support to the classroom teachers of ESOL students.
Soto, Dayanara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Responsible for data collection, intervention, schedules, systems, and iReady.
Simmerly, Tina	Teacher, ESE	Provide programs and services that meet the unique cognitive, social, and emotional needs of gifted students
Valentine, Ambia	School Counselor	Responsible for providing a developmental program addressing the academic, social, and emotional needs of all students.
Chalas, Delia	Reading Coach	Responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in implementing reading instruction K-5, Train and support teachers in Wonders Curriculum and BEST standards for k-2.
Dominguez, Melanie	Instructional Coach	Responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in implementing instruction PK-5. Provides support for new teachers and mentors.
Feintuch, Lindsay	Dean	Provides discipline support for teachers and classified personnel; Oversees the MTSS process

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/19/2021, Matthew Hendricks

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
76

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,100

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

2

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

25

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	36	130	159	127	172	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	773
Attendance below 90 percent	2	22	14	17	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Monday 7/19/2021

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	90	118	83	110	98	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	12	18	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	1	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	

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	90	118	83	110	98	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	12	18	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	1	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	

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					57%	57%		56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					58%	58%		55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	53%		48%	48%
Math Achievement					63%	63%		63%	62%
Math Learning Gains					61%	62%		57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					48%	51%		46%	47%
Science Achievement					56%	53%		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					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Reading and Math beginning, middle, and end of year diagnostics were used to progress monitor all grade levels for ELA and mathematics.

The district-provided PMAs were used to progress monitor 5th-grade science at the end of quarter 1, quarter 2, and quarter 3.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33%	47%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	41%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	43%	50%
	English Language Learners	24%	37%	55%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18%	47%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	35%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	21%	64%
	English Language Learners	18%	26%	61%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	54%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	59%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	13%	27%
	English Language Learners	23%	40%	50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	39%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	34%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	27%	33%
	English Language Learners	23%	27%	53%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	63%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	34%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	17%	39%
	English Language Learners	25%	29%	46%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	45%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	22%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	17%	39%
	English Language Learners	15%	27%	50%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	57%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	39%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	23%	23%	31%
	English Language Learners	38%	41%	53%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35%	50%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	7%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	15%	15%
	English Language Learners	6%	18%	44%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	37%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	32%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	14%	28%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26%	43%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	20%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	8%
	English Language Learners	5%	14%	37%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	62%	64%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	60%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	38%	40%	40%
	English Language Learners	55%	55%	54%

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	32			26			8				
ELL	53	37	33	50	21		30				
ASN	62			62							
BLK	45			45							
HSP	59	41	36	55	32	23	48				
WHT	72	50		73	52		56				
FRL	48	55	25	47	41	27	33				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	41

English Language Learners	
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	62
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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	61
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Based on i-Ready diagnostic data for ELA from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, proficiency went from 43% to 68% for overall placement. Consistent gains were made across grade levels in each ESSA group with an exception to second-grade economically disadvantaged students who decreased by 6% points from the MOY to the EOY.

Based on i-Ready diagnostic data for Math from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, proficiency went from 29% to 67% for overall placement.

Based on 5th-grade science PMA data, students averaged 63% proficiency on all three assessments.

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

In math, students with disabilities made the least growth from the BOY diagnostic to the EOY diagnostic across all grade levels with an average of 25% growth. Additionally, in 5th grade, students with disabilities remained at 0% proficiency for all three diagnostics

In ELA, students with disabilities made an average of 18.6% growth from the BOY diagnostic to the EOY across grade levels. Economically disadvantaged made an average growth of 18% from the BOY to the EOY across grade levels. English Language Learners made an average of 20% growth from the BOY diagnostic to the EOY diagnostic across grade levels.

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

Limited access to a proper learning environment and curriculum to support the diverse needs of students. Ensuring differentiated support through small group instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

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

Based on i-Ready diagnostic data for ELA from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, proficiency went from 43% to 68% for overall placement.

Based on 5th-grade science PMA data, students averaged 63% proficiency on all three assessments.

Based on i-Ready diagnostic data for Math from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, proficiency went from 29% to 67% for overall placement.

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

More structured PLC and common planning time for teams allowed for collaboration and sharing expertise on standards-based best practices.

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

Students will be exposed to upcoming content, focusing on essential vocabulary and background knowledge in small groups, prior to whole group lessons in order to build schema and foundational understanding to show proficiency on grade-level standards.

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.

Professional development will address concepts of acceleration and how to implement effective strategies in classrooms. Additionally, professional development will focus on best practices for small group instruction which includes strategies that stimulate student thinking, by scaffolding instruction, and introducing new concepts prior to new learning.

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

With strategic lesson planning, data collection, and analysis to develop action plans for instruction. Additionally, walk-throughs and coaching cycles will be implemented to provide teachers with specific feedback on small group instruction.

Interventionists and resource teachers will support classroom teachers by providing direct instruction to our most critical students based on data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Establish effective teaching and learning practices during small group instruction to support student mastery of standards and expected learning gains. Differentiating instruction for students allows teachers to address individual student learning needs in a systematic fashion.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of small group instruction throughout the 2021-2022 school year, we expect 70% of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade to be at or above achievement level in FSA 2022 ELA and Math Assessment. We also expect 70% of students in 5th grade to score at or above achievement level on the 2022 State Science Assessment. In addition, as a result of small group instruction, we expect 70% of students in kindergarten through 2nd grade to show mastery on the end-of-year i-Ready diagnostics for reading and math.
Monitoring:	Standards-aligned assessment to include i-Ready Diagnostics, the district assigned progress monitoring assessments, small group coaching walks, and grade level common assessments will be used to measure and monitor effective small group practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie Dominguez (melanie.dominguez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through common planning, professional development, and data analysis, our teachers will plan collaboratively for small group instruction that accelerates learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development to acquire knowledge about best practices for small group instruction that support student achievement. Common planning is a time for instructional staff to discuss data and ways to enhance or improve instruction. Through acceleration and front-loading information in standards-aligned instruction and reviewing student performance through data analysis, we should be able to collaboratively create and implement small group instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Plan alongside grade-level teams to support a collective mindset to continue to improve standards-aligned lessons for small group instruction focusing on reading and writing.

Person Responsible	Delia Chalas (delia.chalas@ocps.net)

Plan alongside grade-level teams to support a collective mindset to continue to improve standards-aligned lessons for small group instruction focusing on math.

Person Responsible	Melanie Dominguez (melanie.dominguez@ocps.net)

Coaching walks to provide specific feedback on instructional delivery base on small group practices.

Person Responsible	Melanie Dominguez (melanie.dominguez@ocps.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Intervention	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through intervention, students will receive differentiated instruction to close achievement gaps based on individual needs for students on MTSS Tier II.

Measurable Outcome:	As a result of intervention throughout the 2021-2022 school year, we expect 70% of students identified as MTSS Tier 2 in kindergarten through 5th grade to reach the EOY iReady typical growth for reading based on the individual score reports.
Monitoring:	There are several ways that our school team will me monitoring for this desired outcome. The MTSS coach will actively monitor the growth monitoring data and meet monthly with individual teachers to analyze progress monitoring data. Instructional coaches will conduct learning walks during intervention to provide support and feedback. Teachers of students that are MTSS Tier 2 will conduct monthly parent meetings to discuss intervention progress monitoring data and encourage parental support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsay Feintuch (lindsayfeintuch@gmail.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers of students on MTSS Tier II will implement several different evidenced-based intervention strategies depending upon the students' needs. These include SIPPS, EIR 1 and 2, Phonics for Reading, and Reading Mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are using this intervention tools because they have proven to increase student achievement by meeting students' individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Actively monitor the growth monitoring assessment data and meet monthly with individual teachers to analyze progress to modify groups and instruction as needed.

Person Responsible	Lindsay Feintuch (lindsayfeintuch@gmail.com)

Conduct learning walks during the intervention to provide support and feedback.

Person Responsible	Delia Chalas (delia.chalas@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the i-Ready BOY diagnostic in reading, 42% of students are performing on grade level. For the 20-21 school year, 63% of our students scored 3 and above on the FSA ELA in 3-5. 46% achieved a learning gain, whereas 33% of our lowest 25% achieved a learning gain. To increase proficiency in ELA, our focus will be to establish effective teaching and learning practices for ELA instruction to support student mastery of standards and expected learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of our focus on ELA instruction throughout the 2021-2022 school year, we expect 70% of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade to be at or above achievement level in FSA 2022 ELA. In addition, as a result of small group instruction, we expect 70% of students in kindergarten through 2nd grade to show mastery of the end-of-year i-Ready diagnostics for reading.
Monitoring:	We will use the i-Ready diagnostics, i-Ready growth monitoring, District standards-based unit assessments, and FBS tracking tools to monitor student proficiency. Additionally, we will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor instructional practice and provide feedback to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delia Chalas (delia.chalas@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Rationale for Strategy Selection: This selected instructional practice(s) has/have a strong level of evidence, as noted in the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding. Additionally, we have a schoolwide vocabulary focus across all content areas to emphasize using context clues and word parts to help identify the meaning of unknown words.

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	Delia Chalas (delia.chalas@ocps.net)

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

Person Responsible	Delia Chalas (delia.chalas@ocps.net)

Provide targeted ELA PD based on teacher needs (consider B.E.S.T. ELA Canvas course, recorded sessions from the Early Literacy Summer Institute, and when applicable, ELA IMPACT).

Person Responsible	Delia Chalas (delia.chalas@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 finding

Person Responsible	Lindsay Feintuch (lindsayfeintuch@gmail.com)

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.

The discipline data on SafeSchoolsforAlex.org for the 2019-2020 school year shows Water Spring Elementary School's incident rating was high compared to the incident rating across the state. The school year of 2019-2020 was the inaugural year at Water Spring ES. Teachers and administrators began to establish procedures, routines, and behavioral expectations. For the 2020-2021 school year, Water Spring welcomed a Dean to the campus. The Student Code of Conduct is embedded in the student support routine. Water Spring ES also established a positive behavioral support system to reward students for appropriate behavior. The incident rate continues to decline with these supports in place.

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, 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 in order 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.

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

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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Intervention	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**