

Orange County Public Schools

Waterbridge Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (57%)
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	ATSI
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Waterbridge Elementary

11100 GALVIN DR, Orlando, FL 32837

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">88%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	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 ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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.
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	Staffing Specialist	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 2022 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

580

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

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	79	84	82	117	79	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	13	23	31	26	9	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	8	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	13	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	28	63	12	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	25	9	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	31	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	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	0

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	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	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	56%	56%				53%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						54%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						51%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	46%	50%				60%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	66%						54%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						39%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	61%	59%				49%	56%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	63%	-12%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	37	38	23	43	38	33				
ELL	47	65	55	54	63	56	39				
ASN	80			80							
BLK	37	65	70	41	61	47	38				
HSP	51	61	50	54	66	67	59				
WHT	46	47		61	63		40				
FRL	46	61	59	50	64	48	51				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 proficiency in all grade levels 3-5 for the FSA ELA assessment. During the 2021-22 school year, 3rd grade proficiency was 39%, followed by 38% in 4th grade, and 36% in 5th grade. This data is based on the number of students that were assessed (data is not scrubbed data).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components that represents the greatest need of improvement is: Reading proficiency (49%) and Reading Learning Gains of the lowest 25% (53%).

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 include but are not limited to: teachers need to continue to increase their knowledge in providing effective small group lessons and instruction, as well as ELA interventions. Teachers also need support in incorporating ELL strategies for students that speak different languages as well as UDL and ESE strategies.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The area that showed the most improvement was Math learning gains (from 45% to 66%) and Math learning gains of the lowest 25% (from 43% to 58%).

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

The contributing factors were an increase in teacher knowledge and efficacy in math for small group instruction and intervention.

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, both for those students on grade level and those just arriving to grade level (GAP or bubble students).

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 ongoing professional development in intervention and enrichment programs and resources/materials for ELA and Math whole group, small group, and intervention instruction.

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.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 47% of 3rd graders, 55% of 4th graders, 39% of 5th graders scored below proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA).

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 6% (from 49% to 55%) for our overall ELA achievement score in grades 3-5 combined.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

i-Ready Diagnostics
i-Ready Growth Monitoring
Classroom Walkthroughs
District Standards Based Unit Assessments
F.A.S.T

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This selected instructional practices have 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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

Person Responsible

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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 achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

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:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We 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 an

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Collect and monitor 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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Description: Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally.

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 improve student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our 2022-23 Panorama data will show at least as 5% increase for students as it pertains to their social awareness and sense of empathy and considering perspectives of others.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will use and monitor Panorama survey results and data for the 2022-23 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students with disabilities (SWD) is the only group that has been identified as an ESSA subgroup scoring below the index of 41%. Based on the 21-22 FSA assessment, the SWD data was as follows: 21% ELA achievement, 37% ELA learning gains, 38% ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%, 23% Math achievement, 43% Math Learning gains, 38% Math learning gains of the lowest 25%, and 33% Science Achievement. Although these percentages have increased since the last subgroup data was obtained in 2019, there is still room for improvement in all areas for our SWD subgroup to move beyond the 41% index as this group has scored below the index for 3 consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

Data for students with disabilities will increase as follows:

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

- ELA achievement increase by 6% (from 21% to 26%)
- ELA Learning Gains increase by 6% (from 37% to 43%)
- ELA Learning Gains lowest 25% by 6% (from 38% to 44%)
- Math achievement increase by 6% (from 23% to 29%)
- Math Learning Gains increase by 6% (from 43% to 49%)
- Math Learning lowest 25% increase by 6 % (from 38% to 44%)
- Science achievement increase by 6% (from 33% to 39%)

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- i-Ready Diagnostics
- i-Ready Growth Monitoring
- Classroom Walkthroughs
- District Standards Based Unit Assessments
- F.A.ST

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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. We will also continue to analyze data, monitor instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that will improve student outcomes. Students will interact in small group instruction, intervention, and receive support services from our ESE teacher and team.

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.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will continue to strengthen the common planning process and use district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions. We will also provide teachers with ongoing PD that supports general education instruction for students with disabilities.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.
Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

At the beginning of the 22-23 school year 81% of Kindergarten students scored within the tier 2 range on the iReady beginning of the year diagnostic. By the end of the 22-23 school year, we would like to see a decrease in tier 2 students by at least 40%.

At the beginning of the 22-23 school year 9% of 1st grade students scored within the tier 3 range, followed by 70% within the tier 2 range on the iReady beginning of the year diagnostic. By the end of the 22-23 school year, we would like to see a decrease in tier 3 by 5%, and tier 2 by at least 40%.

At the beginning of the 22-23 school year 34% of 2nd grade students scored within the tier 3 range, followed by 44% within the tier 2 range on the iReady beginning of the year diagnostic. By the end of the 22-23 school year, we would like to see a decrease in tier 3 by 25%, and tier 2 by at least 20%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

47% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on the 3rd grade FSA ELA assessment during the 21-22 school year. For the 22-23 school year we would like to decrease the number of level 1s and 2s and increase the level of students scoring level 3 or above by 11% which would result in 50% of 3rd grade students achieving the goal of proficiency.

55% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on the 4th grade ELA assessment during the 21-22 school year. For the 22-23 school year we would like to decrease the number of level 1s and 2s and increase the level of students scoring level 3 or above by 12% which would result in 50% of 4th grade students achieving the goal of proficiency.

39% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on the 5th grade FSA ELA assessment during the 21-22 school year. For the 22-23 school year we would like to decrease the number of level 1s and 2s and increase the level of students scoring level 3 or above by 14% which would result in 50% of 3rd grade students achieving the goal of proficiency.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Weekly ELA walkthroughs by administrators. Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and learning community leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dock, Arsha, arsha.dock@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidence-based practices: 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.

Evidence-based programs:

-Heggerty: Develops awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters

-SIPPS: Teaches students how to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words and builds students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These selected instructional practices 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:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	Dock, Arsha, arsha.dock@ocps.net
Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, etc... to fit area(s) of need. Literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Dock, Arsha, arsha.dock@ocps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 ste

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

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. Jennifer Karim-Resource Teacher

Ms. Tiffany Perry-Instructional Coach

Ms. Darlene Olmo-Staffing Specialist

Ms. Megan Roy-3rd grade teacher & SELL team member

Ms. Lyndsey Albertson-ESE teacher & SELL team member

Ms. Jennifer Knippenberg-1st grade teacher & SELL team member