

Orange County Public Schools

# Water Spring Elementary



## 2022-23 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Water Spring Elementary

16000 WATER SPRINGS BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<http://waterspringes.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Matthew Hendricks**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2022

<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>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	29%
<b>2021-22 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
<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>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Water Spring Elementary

16000 WATER SPRINGS BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<http://waterspringes.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 PK-5	No	29%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21
Grade	A	

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

With the support of families and the community, we create an enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

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

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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
Hendricks, Matthew	Principal	The principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, district and state policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members.
Keysor, Aundrea	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; maintaining a safe school environment and overseeing the exceptional student education program; and other duties as assigned by the principal.
Dominguez, Melanie	Dean	The Dean works with Student Discipline and positive behavior support, Code of Conduct, Supports 2nd Grade planning, supports new teachers (those who are new to the profession as well as those who are experienced, yet new to the school)
Correia, Susana	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Cruz, Justinanna	Teacher, K-12	
Farwell, Amy	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides instructional support to teachers and oversees and participates in common planning for kindergarten and grade 1. Mrs. Farwell also supports teachers in data analysis and planning for differentiated activities small group instruction ad next steps in instruction.
Gingras, Kristin	School Counselor	The School Counselor provides life skills instruction for students through teaching lessons in the classroom, promoting character education and hosting small groups for specific needs.
Matos, Araceli	Teacher, K-12	The teacher leader supports teachers
Nieves, Lyannis	Instructional Technology	The Media Specialist provides access to reading and research material through the media center, as well as supports the technology.
Samuel, Dana	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach for MTSS leads the MTSS program by hosting meetings for students in tiers 2 and 3, leading teachers to resources and trainings. Additionally, she teaches small intervention groups and progress monitoring for students in Tiers 2 and 3. Ms. Samuel supports 3rd grade teachers in data analysis and planning for differentiated activities small group instruction ad next steps in instruction.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Simmerly, Tina	Teacher, K-12	The instructional coach for the Gifted program supports Gifted instruction in grades K-5. She teaches small groups in grades K-2 for students who are Gifted as well as teaching groups in grades 3-5 in to meet the unique cognitive, social, emotional needs. She acts as the LEA for Gifted meetings.
Terrell, Theola	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach for math and science, coordinates testing and textbook resources for the school. She provides instructional support to teachers through PLC's. Ms. Terrell supports grades 4 and 5 in data analysis and planning for differentiated activities small group instruction and next steps in instruction.
Ellington, Antonisha	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal promotes and maintains student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, supporting MTSS-Academics maintaining a safe school environment and a positive behavior system; and other duties as assigned by the principal.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 7/25/2022, Matthew Hendricks

**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**

82

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

1,040

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

1

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

13

### 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	155	185	141	172	158	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	994
Attendance below 90 percent	8	57	42	41	37	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	1	2	46	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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	72%	56%	56%					57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%							58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%							52%	53%
Math Achievement	74%	46%	50%					63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%							61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%							48%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	61%	59%					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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
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	36	61	59	38	54	56	21				
ELL	66	65	55	71	69	63	51				
ASN	81	80		86	60						
BLK	65	61		57	68						
HSP	68	66	52	70	67	59	56				
MUL	78	67		82	83		90				
WHT	76	70	52	78	69	60	82				
FRL	63	55	36	64	69	63	56				

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

### 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
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	
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	77
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	63
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	61
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	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	70
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	57
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?**

Based on i-Ready diagnostic data for ELA from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, proficiency went from 41% to 68% for overall placement. Consistent gains were made across grade levels in each ESSA group with the exception to 4th and 5th-grade special education students who did not achieve any growth from mid-year to end-of-year. Economically disadvantaged students decreased by 17% points from the MOY to the EOY.

Based on i-Ready diagnostic data for Math from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, proficiency went from 25% to 64% for overall placement.

Based on 5th-grade science PMA data, students averaged 70% proficiency on all three assessments.

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

In math, students with disabilities made the least growth from the BOY diagnostic to the EOY diagnostic across all grade levels with an average of 25% growth. Additionally, in 4th and 5th grade, students with disabilities remained at 0% proficiency, for all three diagnostics, while 2nd grade decreased by 6% from BOY to EOY. In ELA, students with disabilities made an average of 24% growth from the BOY diagnostic to the EOY across grade levels. Economically disadvantaged made an average growth of % from the BOY to the EOY across grade levels. English Language Learners made an average of % growth from the BOY diagnostic to the EOY diagnostic across grade levels

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

Limited understanding of differentiated instruction to support the diverse needs of students. Establishing targeted, differentiated, small group instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities and those in the Tiers of Support.

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

Based on i-Ready diagnostic data for ELA from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, proficiency went from 41% to 68% for overall placement. When looking at grades 3-5 FSA results, 72% of students were proficient compared to 64% from the previous year. Of the Lowest 25%, 53% were proficient compared to 33% the year prior.

Based on 5th-grade science PMA data, students averaged 70% proficiency on all three assessments.

On the 5th grade FCAT Science, students achieved 70% proficiency.

Based on i-Ready diagnostic data for Math from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, proficiency went from 25% to 64% for overall placement. When looking at grades 3-5 FSA results, 74% of students demonstrated proficiency which was an increase from the 2021 school year when 63% of students were proficient. In math, students achieved learning gains (68% 2022 compared to 39% 2021) and the lowest 25th percentile increased from 26% in 2021 to 62% in 2022.

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



Highly structured PLC's and common planning time allowed for teams increased collaboration and sharing of expertise on standards-based best practices. Additionally, weekly classroom walk-throughs during intervention and small group instruction were consistent practice where actionable feedback was provided. The coaching cycle was utilized to support struggling teachers to increase their instructional practice.

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

In order to support accelerated learning, we will need to focus on differentiation and scaffolding during targeted small group instruction. Additionally, students will be working with interventionists based on the results of screeners, diagnostic results, and tiered support data. We will also expose students to upcoming content, focusing on essential vocabulary and building background knowledge in small groups, prior to whole group lessons in order to build schema and foundational understanding to demonstrate proficiency of grade-level standards.

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

Our professional development this year will focus on assisting teachers with focusing on scaffolding differentiated small group instruction which stimulates student thinking, by scaffolding instruction, and introducing new concepts and vocabulary prior to new learning. Additionally, we will focus on strategies to support our ESE and ELL students.

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

New services implemented this year to ensure the sustainability of improvement include strategic lesson planning, data collection, and analysis to develop action plans for instruction. Additionally, walk-throughs and coaching cycles will be implemented to provide teachers with specific feedback on small group instruction. Interventionists and resource teachers will support classroom teachers by providing direct instruction to our most critical students based on data.

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

Differentiated and targeted small group instruction in ELA and Math are needed to address the learning needs of all students at Water Spring. Specific attention and targeting of SWD (Students with Disabilities), ELL (English Language Learners), and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) as these students performed lower in ELA and math. Differentiating instruction for students allows teachers to address individual student learning needs in a systematic fashion.

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

As a result of small group instruction and differentiated instruction throughout the 2022-2023 school year, students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade will be at 74% in ELA and 76% in math on the 3rd administration of the FAST Assessment. We also expect 73% of students in 5th grade to score at or above achievement level on the 2022 State Science Assessment. In addition, as a result of small group instruction, we expect 74% of students in kindergarten through 2nd grade to show mastery of the end-of-year PMA for reading and math.

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

Small group, differentiated instruction based on similar student needs focusing on high-priority skills or concepts which are essential to academic success. While our school scored well overall, we need to increase learning gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile and lower-performing subgroups by providing targeted, intensive, small group instruction that effectively meets the needs of lower-performing students. Monitor student achievement for the narrowing of the achievement gap through bi-weekly formative assessments. Utilize multiple data sources to determine the effectiveness of the instruction and adjust instruction as needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amy Farwell (amy.farwell@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented**

Professional development will be implemented to acquire knowledge about utilizing data to determine instructional decisions for small group instruction that support student achievement. Common planning and PLC's are a time for instructional staff to discuss data and determine the next steps for instruction.

**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 school team will use FSA results, paired with i-Ready assessments, PMA's and other diagnostic tools to identify groups of students with similar needs and establish high-priority skills and concepts. Using this data, the school team will be able to target gaps in student learning as they support their growth with standards-based instruction utilizing research-based intervention materials and formative assessments. Targeting specific skills and/or concepts, will allow teachers to monitor students' progress as well as the narrowing the achievement gaps for low-performing subgroups. Teachers will make adjustments to instruction as needed to ensure that each student is making adequate growth in his/her learning.

### **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.

1. Analyze data to group students with similar needs.

**Person Responsible** Dana Samuel (dana.samuel@ocps.net)

2. Focusing on high priority skills or concepts which are critical to academic success through differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible** Amy Farwell (amy.farwell@ocps.net)

3. Identify research-based resources to target student needs interventions.

**Person Responsible** Amy Farwell (amy.farwell@ocps.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

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

Through Acceleration, we will increase student performance of SWD (Students with Disabilities) and ELL (English Language Learners) and supporting bottom 25%.  
 Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners subgroups are performing significantly lower than all other students in ELA. 3rd, 4th and 5th graders are performing lower than those students in K-2 in ELA. Only 53% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA. In order to increase proficiency in ELA, intensified focus in ELA instruction is critical to narrowing the achievement gap for our lowest performing students.

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

As a result of utilizing high yield strategies for our SWD and ELL students, such as Acceleration and Pre-Teaching Vocabulary in 7 Steps, we expect 60% of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th to increase from 53% to 60% and achieve learning gains based on FAST end of year results. Additionally, we expect 70% of students in kindergarten through 2nd grade to demonstrate an increase in skills.

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

The intervention team at Water Spring will utilize research based strategies through differentiated centers, support facilitation, push-in, and ELL paraprofessional support to implement high yield strategies to close the achievement gap for our SWD and ELL students. Progress monitoring will occur through formative assessments and adjust instruction as necessary.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

Plan small group instruction to target vocabulary through Acceleration and Pre-Teaching Vocabulary in 7 Steps. Intentionally planning for and embedding ESE and ELL strategies into lesson plans.

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

This strategy was chosen to better respond to the varying needs of students. Multiple measures of data were used to determine students for MTSS tiers, pull out resource support, support facilitation within the classroom, bilingual paraprofessional support, materials utilized for instruction, and more.

**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.

1. Analyzing data to create instructional groupings which focus on ELL and SWD students with similar needs.

**Person Responsible** Susana Correia (susana.correia@ocps.net)

2. Protect planning time of ESE teachers and those who are working with ELL students to allow for attendance at PLC's and collaborative planning.

**Person Responsible** Susana Correia (susana.correia@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.**

Water Spring builds a positive school culture and environment through CHAMPS and Class Do-Jo. This system of positive behavior support allows students to understand expectations, take pride in their school and work hard to earn points for not only their class, but their grade level. Students are also awarded Otter Bucks for engaging in positive behavior, hard work, and great citizenship. The Otter Store is open weekly for the students to "shop". Families and the community see the joy our Otter Store bring our school Family.

Water Spring staff are encouraged to participate in Professional Learning activities both on and off campus and this fosters an environment of collaborative leadership. Staff members bring this knowledge back to the school family and share new practices and knowledge. They are active participants in committees in areas of personal interest, support before and after school clubs, participate in SAC and are PTO liaisons.

Stakeholders are invited and encouraged to participate in monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings where community input supports decision making at our school. During these meetings school wide data is shared and discussed along with budgetary decisions and student and school needs. Also, our Parent and Teacher Organization (PTO) meets monthly to plan school and community events. Parent input is provided and the PTO votes on school-wide activities. Water Spring welcomes and encourages visitors to volunteer through ADDitons or become a Partner in Education. We welcome stakeholders to be active members in our school community.

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

Water Spring Administrative Leadership Team: Provides the broad goals for the school year as well as models positive and supportive relationships and attitudes. Monitoring of the culture and environment occurs daily. Staff, parents, students and community members make up a positive school culture and environment.

Instructional Leadership Team: Assist teachers in implementing positive behavior support structures (CHAMPS) and modeling positive and supportive relationships and attitudes.

All staff: Support and promote positive behavior support structures (CHAMPS) with students and celebrate positive behaviors with parents. Partnerships with parents occur through classroom activities and frequent

communication related to their child's accomplishments. Water Spring strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.