

Orange County Public Schools

# Waterford Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Waterford Elementary

12950 LAKE UNDERHILL RD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Danielle Arbelaez Willis**

Start Date for this Principal: 10/11/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Waterford Elementary

12950 LAKE UNDERHILL RD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">66%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">71%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	C	C	B

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

## 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 community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Arbelaez-Willis, Danielle	Principal	Curriculum Leader, Instructional Support , 1st, 3rd, 5th, Specials, Coaching, Evaluating, Lesson Plans, PLCs Grades/ monitoring, Report Cards, Progress Reports, iObservation, Professional Learning, Bottom 25% monitoring, SELL, SAC, PTO Point Person, Budget, Staff Report, Threat Assessments
Ebert-Jones, Jennifer	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum support, Science support, Science fair, Testing Coordinator (FSA, iReady), iReady Lead , PD Points, School Calendar, Staff & Parent Newsletter, PLC, Staff Development coordinator, Certification, Portfolios, Interns, Field trips, Fundraisers, Teach-In, Tutoring Coordinator, Skyward Cap, School, Committees, Quarterly & EOY Awards, Interventions
Farrow, Deadra	Other	Literacy Committee Lead, Battle of the Books, Literacy Night, Book Fair, Accelerated Reader Lead, DCTL Lead, 5 Star Chair, Fixed Assets/Property manager, Textbooks, Media Center Schedule, Media Center lessons Spelling Bee Liaison, Interventions
Carey, Aimee	Other	MTSS Coach, Curriculum support, Science support, Science fair, STEM night Committee lead, PD Points, School Calendar, Certification, Portfolios, School Committees, Interventions
Anderson, Amber	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, PLC, Coaching Teachers, Curriculum support, Science fair, STEM night, Literacy Night , School Committees, Interventions
Wise, Michael	Other	Discipline, Positive behavior system (PBS)
Soto Rosario, Jeannette	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Specialist, Facilitates ESE meetings, ELL support, Facilitates ELL meetings, 504 Coordinator, Facilitates 504 Meetings
Anderson, Patrice	School Counselor	SELL Lead, Threat Assessments, Small group social skills support, Child Safety Matters, Health curriculum, Red Ribbon week, Character Ed Program, Character Trait Celebration, Homeless McKinney Vento Coordinator, News Crew, Pantry, Interventions

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Friday 10/11/2019, Danielle Arbelaez Willis



**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

42

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

504

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

5

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

4

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	11	64	89	100	87	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	24	18	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 7/20/2021

**2020-21 - As Reported**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	23	100	106	95	124	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	12	20	10	12	23	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**2020-21 - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	23	100	106	95	124	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	12	20	10	12	23	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	57%	57%	68%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	58%	58%	64%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	52%	53%	51%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				66%	63%	63%	74%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				46%	61%	62%	69%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				24%	48%	51%	53%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	56%	53%	51%	55%	55%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	63%	4%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

iReady BOY, MOY, and EOY diagnostic assessments were utilized for progress monitoring for all grade levels for Reading and Math. PMA data was used for 5th grade Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	36	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	26	38
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	15	27	19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	31	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	22	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	31	13	25

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	35	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	25	32
	Students With Disabilities	10	0	0
	English Language Learners	14	23	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	22	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	13	23
	Students With Disabilities	10	0	0
	English Language Learners	21	13	23

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38	54	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	40	43
	Students With Disabilities	8	17	23
	English Language Learners	24	38	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	35	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	25	39
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	8
	English Language Learners	10	33	43
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	35	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	28	36
	Students With Disabilities	11	0	0
	English Language Learners	32	26	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	22	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	19	44
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	11
	English Language Learners	12	23	49

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	28	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	27	30
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	25
	English Language Learners	23	26	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	19	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	16	34
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	13
	English Language Learners	8	11	37
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	64	73	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	67	69
	Students With Disabilities	0	17	17
	English Language Learners	64	63	69
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8			12							
ELL	63	75		66	75	70	65				
ASN	75			100							
BLK	56	80		54	50		64				
HSP	72	78	83	70	76	74	70				
WHT	75	85		80	65		71				
FRL	61	80	80	64	67	74	65				
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	13	36	32	6	24	18	15				
ELL	47	48	35	48	36	19	32				
ASN	90			90							

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
BLK	63	53		48	20						
HSP	56	54	33	57	45	24	52				
WHT	76	67	46	80	49	25	74				
FRL	53	50	30	53	38	30	41				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	46	45	31	46	38	17				
ELL	42	54	52	58	63	57	10				
BLK	77	76		65	65		45				
HSP	58	56	54	70	69	61	44				
MUL	70			70							
WHT	75	71	50	80	71	38	61				
FRL	55	58	50	65	69	52	37				

**ESSA Data Review**

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	582
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	70
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO



English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	75
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	71
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Overall, across all subject areas, there is a positive trend to our data when comparing diagnostic assessments from fall, winter, and spring.

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

The greatest need for improvement is with our SWD across all grade levels, for all subjects. In all 11 categories utilizing the progress monitoring data for 1st-5th grade for ELA and Math and 5th grade Science, our spring assessments show 25% or less of our ESE students showing proficiency in the respective subjects.

#### 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 the greatest need of improvement for our SWD would be learning loss of skills dating back to March 2020, due to the pandemic and virtual learning that was put into place. The way in which we will address our needs is through rigorous intervention grouping through Walk-to-Intervention model that will be put in place for the 21-22 school year to be able to better address our needs of our students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 5th grade Science by 10% as the proficiency rate was 65% on the 2019 state assessment, and our PMA data shows overall 75% of our students in the Spring of 2021 were proficient.

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

Actions contributing to this improvement included one teacher, dedicated to planning Science instruction using district provided CRMs and resources and an increase in the monitoring of the PMA and common assessment data through individual teacher data chats and PLC meetings geared toward data analysis.

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

In order to accelerate learning, MAO acceleration tutoring will be a focus for the 21-22 school year. Data meetings will be conducted after each iReady diagnostic assessment in addition to before

Spring State assessments to determine needs, next steps and consistently monitor student data and groupings.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

The professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers are trainings related to tutoring, differentiation in the classroom during whole and small group instruction, and intervention/enrichment resource and instruction.

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

Data meetings will be conducted after each iReady diagnostic assessment in addition to before Spring State assessments to determine needs, next steps and consistently monitor student data and groupings.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** To increase the learning gains for the lowest 30% in ELA and in Math

**Measurable Outcome:**  
 Based on 18-19 FSA data: The learning gains for students in ELA was 35%. Our intended outcome was to increase the learning gains to 54%, thus surpassing the state average by 1%.  
 Based on 20-21 EOY iReady data, FSA projections were as follows:  
 ELA - Achievement =63; Learning Gains = 64; Low 25% = 86  
 Math - Achievement =40; Learning Gains = 21; Low 25% = 18  
 The 18-19 FSA gains for students with disabilities was 24%. Our intended outcome was to increase the learning gains for our students with disabilities to a minimum of 41%. Based on 20-21 EOY iReady FSA projections - SWD (ESSA group) would have had LGs for ELA of 86%.  
 For 21-22, our intended outcome is to increase the learning gains for our students with disabilities to at least 41%.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored through PLC meetings and individual teacher data meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 1. Revamp system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes in PLC meetings.  
 2. Through PLC collaboration, teachers will make content, skills and concepts explicit by showing and telling students what to do or think while solving problems, enacting strategies, completing tasks and classifying concepts.  
 3. Build our culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) through ESE PL meetings to increase student success.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 1. Teachers need to study their practice to improve student learning, validate reasoned hypotheses about salient instructional features and enhance instructional decision making.  
 2. Teachers need to increase their systematic use of explicit instruction.  
 3. In regards to our ESSA group - after Exceptional Student Education teachers develop instructional goals, they evaluate and make ongoing adjustments to students' instructional programs based on student data.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Continue to use District Professional Learning Community strategies during ELA and Math instruction.
2. Monitor iReady dashboard
3. Monitor trends in common assessments
4. Weekly Reading and Math tutoring.
5. Teachers will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs and provided actionable feedback as well as Tier 3 teachers provided support through the Coaching cycle.
6. Data Meetings

**Person Responsible** Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@ocps.net)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Student academic success will be enriched when students have multiple opportunities to interact with other(students and adults) and create meaningful connections to academic content.

**Measurable Outcome:** Parent Survey - increase by 0.5%  
 Improvement in our Discipline and Threat data - decrease by 50%; move from 120 referrals to 60 referrals or less by the end of the year.

**Monitoring:** Discipline data will be reviewed monthly by the leadership team.  
 Threat assessment data will be reviewed monthly through TAT meetings.  
 Attendance data will be reviewed monthly by the attendance team.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Patrice Anderson (patrice.anderson@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Through distributive leadership in combination with social-emotional learning opportunities, academic success with be increased for all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Collaboration with general education teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff is necessary to support students’ learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students’ social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Conduct monthly Threat Assessment meetings with TAT/analyze data for trends.
2. Conduct daily check-ins with at-risk students with a designated staff member.
3. Implement school wide Positive Behavior Intervention System to positively impact school climate and culture
4. Design and implement specific professional training opportunities for staff that details how integrating academics and social-emotional learning are essential to student success.

**Person Responsible** Patrice Anderson (patrice.anderson@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Our primary area of concern are our threats to others.**

**We will conduct monthly Threat Assessment meetings with TAT/analyze data for trends. We will conduct daily check-ins with at-risk students with a designated staff member. We will implement school wide Positive Behavior Intervention System to positively impact school climate and culture. We will design and implement specific professional training opportunities for staff that details how integrating academics and social-emotional learning are essential to student success.**

#### **Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

##### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Waterford Elementary continues to focus on increasing parental involvement and community support. We are doing this by keeping our school website and Facebook page continually updated. We are also keeping our parents informed through Connect Orange and digital newsletters. Teachers use Class Dojo and other forms of communication that keep parents involved in student progress both academically and behaviorally. Open House,

Meet the Teacher, PTA meetings and events and the School Advisory Committee (SAC) are also avenues in which Waterford ES communicates and build positive relationships with all stakeholders. Each teacher has also been provided with a grade specific Sanford Harmony Kit to use within in their classroom during the health course as well.

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

PTA and SAC meet monthly addressing needs of the school, concerns, and ideas on how to bring the community together. PIE (Partners in Education) assist in providing incentives to staff while we attend various events around the community.

#### **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>