

Orange County Public Schools

Washington Shores Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/26/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
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* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: F (25%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%)
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	CSI
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	99%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	F		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
Jackson Kimble, Myrlene	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 to improve instruction and academic student success. Mrs. Jackson- Kimble holds weekly Professional Learning Community meetings at each grade with leadership team members to discuss the intensity of standards-based instruction, Tier I and Tier II interventions, and 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.
Coley, Altamont	Assistant Principal	Mr. Coley, Assistant Principal: Assists the school principal with curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives following the School Improvement Plan. Mr. Coley supports teachers in implementing and monitoring effective whole group and small group instruction. He also observes and conducts staff evaluations and provides support to teachers. Mr. Coley supervises students during the instructional day while implementing and supporting school-wide behavior initiatives. He monitors the progress of the lowest twenty-five percent of students using the MTSS process. Mr. Coley coordinates coaching support for teachers utilizing the leadership team and coordinates professional development for non-instructional staff. He oversees Summer Acceleration Reading Camp and completes all master scheduling. Mr. Coley is also an active participant in SAC.
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 high-yield instructional practices by providing actionable feedback to teachers to promote student learning when using the coaching cycle framework. Mr. Hird oversees the promotion and retention process, and 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.
McMillion, Vanessa	Math Coach	Mrs. McMillion serves as a behavior and instructional leader. She supports the K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Standards. She progress monitors grade-level science content, oversees that appropriate science strategies are being implemented in classrooms as well as

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		monitors the assessments to ensure that the data reflects improved student learning. Mrs. McMillion also oversees our school-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program to support all students in building positive behavior expectations and habits to achieve high academic achievement.
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 high-yield instructional practices and monitors the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement.
Williams, Shacaree	Staffing Specialist	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 7/26/2022, Myrlene Jackson Kimble

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

325

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

14

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

3

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	13	57	57	61	57	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	293
Attendance below 90 percent	7	27	28	30	26	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	29	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	7	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	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

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	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

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	27%	56%	56%				29%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						42%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	22%						52%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	19%	46%	50%				48%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	19%						51%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						43%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	19%	61%	59%				41%	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	25%	55%	-30%	58%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	27%	57%	-30%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

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	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	63%	-19%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	57%	-19%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	53%	-13%
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	8	6		9	6		6				
ELL	22	29		8	12		8				
BLK	26	36	23	20	21	33	18				
HSP	33			15							
FRL	24	37	24	16	20	33	19				

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				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	27
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	219
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	6
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	21
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	24
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	27
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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?

The first trend that emerges across grade levels is a decrease in overall proficiency in our intermediate grade levels as evidenced by the Florida Standardized Assessments (FSA). Our 2020-2021 ELA scores show that only 27% of students in our intermediate grade levels are proficient. Only 19% of students were proficient on the Math FSA. Our ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWDs), indicates the greatest gap when compared to their peers and will need to be an area of focus.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments (FSA), the data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement based upon the 2021-2022 School Grade Data include math proficiency, math learning gains and science, all of which were at 19%. When looking at the Spring 2022 FSA Mathematics Grade Level School Results reports, fifth grade math proficiency was the lowest at 10%. There will also be focus on ELA and Science proficiency.

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

Based on i-Ready, common assessment, and informal teacher assessment data, students in the intermediate grade levels struggle with math fluency and foundational skills. Students would benefit from small group instruction to support foundational and prerequisite skills for grade level tasks. Small group instruction will be planned for through the PLC process and monitored through classroom walkthroughs and formative data.

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

All components in the 2022 FSA showed a decline in percentage points when compared to the 2019 FSA. Testing did not occur in the 2019-2020 school year so there were no 2020 FSA results. For the 2020-2021 school year, testing occurred but a school grade was not given. According to the percentage points for each of the components in 2021, Washington Shores did show some improvement in ELA Learning gains from 28% to 37% and Math Lowest 25th Percentile from 19% to 32%. Based on 2022 the Middle of Year i-Ready diagnostic, third-grade students made the most progress towards proficiency in reading and math. The FSA results showed 29% for proficiency in Reading and 30% in Math.

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

The third grade teachers had a better understanding of the depth of the standards. In addition to content knowledge and instructional delivery that were focused upon in the PLCs, interventionists and coaches provided small group support in third grade classrooms.

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

In order to accelerate learning in the upcoming school year, an intense focus will be placed on ensuring the learning acceleration model is implemented during the extended hour of the school day and during

tutoring. Students will have access to high-quality instructional materials that are aligned to the benchmarks. Teachers will integrate lessons using priority standards to provide an appropriate balance of fluency, conceptual understanding, and hands-on practice. Additionally, at prescribed intervals, the groups will rotate. Diagnostic and common assessment data will be used to determine acceleration groupings and resources. Instructional resources that will be utilized including i-Ready scaffolded lessons. For these strategies to work effectively, all teachers will require professional development focused on acceleration practices.

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, the professional development opportunities will be planned for and provided at the school to support acceleration process. High-quality instructional materials will be available to students; therefore, it will be important to provide support to teachers on how to use these resources. In addition, professional development will focus on supporting teachers as they prepare their lessons so they will have a deep understanding of the content and be able to effectively deliver it to students. Through common planning, coaches will model lessons, discuss engagement strategies, and clarify misconceptions.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond are tutoring programs that utilize the learning acceleration model, weekly professional learning community meetings for teachers, professional development based on observed trends, and coaching support.

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 Differentiation

<p>Area of Focus</p> <p>Description and Rationale:</p> <p>Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</p>	<p>Washington Shores Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic engagement strategies. There is a need to differentiate small group instruction to support Tier II and Tier III MTSS students. ELA proficiency was at 27 percentage points and Math proficiency was at 19 percentage points. A continuum of Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to vigorously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support.</p> <p>By providing our staff with ongoing professional development that reinforces proper data collection, progress monitoring, and data analysis, we ensure that students' individual needs are met.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome:</p> <p>State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</p>	<p>By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, students tested on the the F.A.S.T. assessment will show an 14 percentage point increase in proficiency from 27% to 41% in ELA.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, students tested on the the F.A.S.T. assessment will show a 22 percentage point increase in proficiency from 19% to 41% in Math.</p> <p>-----</p>
<p>Monitoring:</p> <p>Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</p>	<p>The school's leadership team will be active participants in all common planning meetings for each content area. Feedback on instructional trends in each content area will be provided during the common planning sessions. The school's leadership team will also attend weekly data meetings, which will focus on analyzing data from common assessments and district progress monitoring assessments to determine trends and needs for changes to instruction. Implementation of any shifts made to lessons will be monitored by the school's leadership by conducting daily classroom walkthroughs. Upon completion of daily walkthroughs, individual feedback will be provided to instructional and support staff via the instructional framework and progress monitoring tools.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy:</p> <p>Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented</p>	<p>Proper implementation and monitoring of the MTSS process will change how students are supported by systematically delivering a range of interventions based on demonstrated levels of need.</p>

for this Area of Focus.**Rationale for Evidence-based**

Strategy: In order to effectively progress monitor, collect and analyze data, the instructional and support staff will receive additional professional development focusing on the elements of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process. As a result, the staff will be better equipped to deliver targeted interventions on a weekly basis, gather and analyze progress monitoring data and make the necessary changes to provide intensive instruction. In addition to the initial layer of professional development, weekly grade-level data meetings will be conducted to analyze student mastery of core content area standards while simultaneously determining the students in need of Tier II or Tier III support.

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.

Design a common planning framework that focuses on disaggregating formative and summative data, standards-based instruction, and engaging instructional delivery.

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

The administration will continually monitor both planning deliverables and the collective delivery of instruction through attendance in common planning and daily instructional walkthroughs. Ongoing actionable feedback will be provided to teachers.

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

The leadership team will maintain an intense focus on Tier I instruction and also provide resources to enhance Tier II and Tier III instruction to support small groupings as we work to close the achievement gap.

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

Focus will occur on engagement strategies/structures for teachers to utilize during whole group and small group instruction. All teachers will use academic vocabulary through discourse to increase student proficiency in all subject areas.

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

Teachers will analyze summative and formative data in all academic areas to adjust differentiation to student needs. Data will be continuously collected and analyzed for all students to ensure alignment and effectiveness of instruction for students receiving Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III supports.

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	<p>Washington Shores Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning standards-based lessons coupled with delivering rigorous instruction to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of B.E.S.T standards.</p> <p>Based on the results from the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), there is a need for instruction to be more rigorous by building the instructional capacity of the classroom teachers in ELA and Math. Less than 70% of students were proficient in both Reading and Math on the FSA.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 50% of the students tested on the F.A.S.T will perform at the proficient level.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>The school leadership team will conduct observational walk-throughs to ensure the implementation of planned instruction is aligned with common planning. After the completion of the observations, school leadership will provide feedback to teachers on the benchmark/standard alignment of their lessons. Actionable feedback will be shared during the weekly PLCs and during school-based meetings. Special emphasis will be placed on closing the achievement gap for students with exceptionalities. Equally important, consistent, streamlined, and explicit written and verbal feedback from the administration on instructional practices, school-wide, will be culturally embedded to enhance pedagogical practices. Student common assessments and i-Ready data will also be used to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	<p>Teachers will plan for and deliver daily instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T standards. Content level coaches as well as district personnel will support teachers in building capacity through the coaching cycle. District and school-based coaches will work with teachers to build standards-based Professional Learning Communities.</p>

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this
strategy.**

The coaching cycle is a structured plan to help teachers and coaches learn and improve. The end result is that their coaching becomes more impactful and their students' learning increases as a result. The coaching cycle has six phases: 1) Set standards-based goals, 2) Develop learning targets, 3) Pre-assess, 4) Co-plan, 5) Co-teaching and 6) Post-assess. In PLCs, educators demonstrate their commitment to helping all students learn by working collaboratively to address the following critical questions: 1) What do we want students to learn? What should each student know and be able to do as a result of each unit or grade level, 2) How will we know if they have learned? Are we monitoring each student's learning on a timely basis? 3) What will we do if they don't learn? 4) What will we do if they already know it?

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.

Grade-level teams will participate in weekly common planning, facilitated by school-based and School Transformation Office (STO) leadership teams to deepen teachers' understanding of the B.E.S.T. standards. During common planning, the facilitator will emphasize the prerequisite skills that are needed; questioning strategies, monitoring techniques, and engagement strategies. Additionally, teachers will model instructional delivery and provide each other feedback. The school-based leadership team will continue meeting with teachers and support staff weekly to discuss student progress and needs in all content areas. ESE support staff will collaborate with teachers and instructional coaches in PLCs to provide high-yield strategies for students with learning disabilities.

**Person
Responsible**

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

The school-based administrators will build a school-wide schedule to observe instructional practices by creating a monthly instructional walkthrough schedule to collect data on instructional trends and student outcomes. Instructional trend data will be calibrated and shared with all teachers and support staff.

**Person
Responsible**

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

The school-based leadership team and district support will provide professional development aligned to B.E.S.T. standards, authentic student engagement, monitoring for student understanding, and high-yield strategies. The trainings will also be based on results of instructional trend data, assessment results, and lesson progression review. These main areas of professional learning will strengthen instructional trends and student progress monitoring data.

**Person
Responsible**

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

The administration will monitor the transference from planning to practice utilizing both school-based and School Transformation Office (STO) facilitated walkthroughs focused on where results of walkthroughs and instructional sweeps are calibrated with the leadership team and teachers to promote reflection and action based upon identified trends. Walkthrough tools utilized will include Google forms that promote both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods.

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

In grades K-2, 43% of students were on track to score a Level 3 or above according to the i-Ready EOY Diagnostic results.

1. In Kindergarten, 66% of students were proficient on the District's i-Ready EOY diagnostic.
2. In First grade, 39% of students were proficient on the District's i-Ready EOY diagnostic.
3. In Second grade, 27% of students were proficient on the District's i-Ready EOY diagnostic.

For Grades K-2:

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade:

* Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

--To prepare students to read words and comprehend text.

* Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

--To allow students to begin spelling and decoding words.

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

The proficiency levels in grades 3-5 were as follows according to the "RAISE Schools Identification 2022-2023" document:

1. In 3rd grade, 29% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
2. In 4th grade, 31% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

3. In 5th grade, 22% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

For Grades 3:

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements:
Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade:

* Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

--To prepare students to read words and comprehend text.

* Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

--To allow students to begin spelling and decoding words.

For Grades 4-5:

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendation meets ESSA strong level of evidence requirements:
Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9:

* Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

-- To think analytically and follow increasingly intricate series of events.

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)

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 60% of students in grades K-2 will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

1) By the end of the year, at least 71% of students in Kindergarten will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

2) By the end of the year, at least 60% of students in first grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

3) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in second grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 41% of tested students in grades 3-5 will achieve a proficient score on the state assessment which is an increase of 14 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

1) By the end of the year, 43% of students in third grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of eleven percentage points when compared to the

previous school year.

2) By the end of the year, 41% of students in fourth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of four percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

3) By the end of the year, 39% of students in fifth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of thirteen percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

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.

In effort to support RAISE, Washington Shores Elementary will use beginning and middle of the year benchmark assessments through F.A.S.T. as well as the i-Ready Instructional Placement Tool. Monitoring will also be accomplished using district common assessment data from the Standards-based Unit Assessments and data gained from documented MTSS interventions provided to students at the Tier II and Tier III levels through such programs as SIPPS and Heggerty. Monthly data meetings will occur with grade level teachers to review students' data and address adjustments that may need to be made in order to monitor response to intervention. Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators will occur to observe the teaching and learning processes including foundational skills and reading interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jackson Kimble, Myrlene, myrlene.jackson-kimble@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?

The school is a part of the School Transformation Office, and will use evidence-based programs such as i-Ready and SIPPS for instruction and monitoring. The school will align with the District's expectation of recommended curriculum, targeted professional development, and differentiated instruction for students who are identified as needing Tier II and Tier III support. The school will use the District approved streamlined walkthrough tool weekly to monitor instruction and identify trends.

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?

The following components of the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Practice Guide identifies strategies when used in tandem with appropriate educational programs like that of Heggerty, SIPPS and i-Ready meet a strong level of evidence to support ESSA subgroups:

-Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)

-Heggerty (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.)

-SIPPS (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

-i-Ready (Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

These evidence-based practices aid in predicting student proficiency and identifying student needs.

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
<p>MTSS process will be constantly monitored as students are properly placed in fluid Tiers based on their needs.</p>	
<p>- Literacy Leadership - The Leadership Team will monitor Functional Basic Skills (FBS) and small group instruction by utilizing classroom walkthroughs.</p>	
<p>- Literacy Coaching - Lessons for small group instruction will be addressed during the PLC process.</p>	<p>Jackson Kimble, Myrlene, myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net</p>
<p>- Assessment - Assessment information gathered from FBS and small group instruction will be utilized to make adjustments to the student groups.</p>	
<p>- Professional Learning - Training in the programs for SIPPS and Heggerty will be available to new employees.</p>	
<p>Teachers will attend PLCs three times per week to go over details of upcoming lessons, plan text-based and benchmark-based questions, and plan for student responses.</p>	
<p>- Literacy Leadership - Leadership Team members will attend and support PLCs as well as follow up with classroom walkthroughs along with data disaggregation so informed decisions about instruction can be made.</p>	
<p>- Literacy Coaching - The Literacy Coach will provide side-by-side coaching and modeling of lessons to aid with the understanding or delivery of content.</p>	<p>Jackson Kimble, Myrlene, myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net</p>
<p>- Assessment - Standards-based Unit Assessments will be utilized to determine students' understanding of content and make adjustments to future lessons. EOY and FSA data are being used to initialize the student groups and upcoming diagnostic data will be used to update the student groups.</p>	
<p>- Professional Learning - Training in SIPPS, Heggerty and B.E.S.T. standards will be available.</p>	

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.

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 school culture and environment.

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 Panorama 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 LIVE school to support 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.