Waterford Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan 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.

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

Waterford Elementary

12950 LAKE UNDERHILL RD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://waterfordes.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	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		C	C

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 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
Arbelaez-Willis, Danielle	Principal	Curriculum Leader, Instructional Support , All areas, 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
Soto Rosario, Jeannette	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Specialist, Facilitates ESE meetings, ELL support, Facilitates ELL meetings, 504 Coordinator, Facilitates 504 Meetings
Wise, Michael	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 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.*
1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

530

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

4

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

5

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	33	87	59	87	87	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	15	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	6	7	10	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	6	3	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 7/12/2022

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	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	

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	
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	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	

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	
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	68%	56%	56%				65%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						59%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						35%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	65%	46%	50%				66%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						46%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						24%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	61%	59%				60%	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	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	63%	4%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
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	3	32	33	23	61	53					
ELL	59	57	33	59	61	42	54				
ASN	55			82							
BLK	57	63	40	31	50	67	20				
HSP	64	61	38	61	62	52	56				
MUL	67			83							
WHT	81	70		80	79		88				
FRL	53	56	34	51	63	61	50				

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							
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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	69
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	47
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	55
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	75
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	80
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	50
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?

Overall, compared to 2021 FSA data, there is a decline in all content areas. However, when compared to 2019 (the last official school grade), we show an increase in 5/7 school grade components.

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

The greatest need for improvement is with our SWD across all grade levels in ELA learning gains and ELA B25%. Compared to 2021 FSA data, our SWD dropped 23% in ELA learning gains.

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 following year. The way in which we will address our needs is through rigorous intervention, data monitoring for identified students, and we will utilize our scheduled intervention/MTSS to focus on SWD and Bottom 25%.

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

All data components show a decline compared to 2021 state assessment scores. The one area however, that was the least decline overall was the Math learning gain data component, as there was a

2% decline.However, there was a 22% increase for this data component compared to 2019 state assessments (the last official school grade).

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

The actions that were contributing factors included team planning dedicated to planning Math instruction using district provided CRMs and resources and an increase in the monitoring of common assessment data through individual teacher data chats and PLC meetings geared toward data analysis. Departmentalization teams were changed to traditional class team planning was increased, and increased Professional development for lesson planning to support instruction.

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 22-23 school year. We will need to provide an opportunity for both ELA and Math tutoring. Data conversations will take place during PLCs to progress monitor student learning. This will help to determine needs, next steps and consistent monitoring of 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 progress monitoring assessment in addition to before Spring State assessments to determine needs, next steps and consistently monitor student data and groupings.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	To increase the learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Based on 19-20 FSA data: The learning gains for students in ELA was 59%. Our intended outcome was to increase the learning gains to 54%, thus surpassing the district average by 1%. Based on 21-22 EOY iReady data, FSA projections were as follows: ELA - Achievement =63; Learning Gains = 64; Low 25% = 86 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: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	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: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	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 PLC meetings to increase student success. 4. Increase data driven conversations between the ESE teacher, the staffing specialist, and MTSS coach to increase student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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. 4. Increased conversations amongst stake holders for SWD / B25 will lead to better goal making for individual students.

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. Continue to use District Professional Learning Community strategies during ELA instruction.
2. Monitor progress monitoring assessments.
3. Professional Development on reteaching content that students weren't proficient on.
4. Monitor trends in common assessments and discussion on reteaching action plan.
5. Weekly Reading tutoring.
6. Teachers will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs and provided actionable feedback as well as Tier 3 teachers provided support through the Coaching cycle.
7. Data Meetings

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	To increase the learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math.
	Based on 21-22 EOY iReady data, FSA projections were as follows: Math - Achievement =40; Learning Gains = 21; Low 25% = 18
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The 21-22 FSA gains for students with disabilities in math was 61%. Our intended outcome was to increase the learning gains for our students with disabilities to a minimum of 41%. The 21-22 FSA proficiency for students with disabilities in math was 23%. Our intended outcome was to increase the math proficiency for our students with disabilities to a minimum of 50%. For 22-23, our intended outcome is to increase the proficiency for our students with disabilities while maintaining our learning gains.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	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: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	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 PLC meetings to increase student success. 4. Increase data driven conversations between the ESE teacher, the staffing specialist, and MTSS coach to increase student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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.
4. Increased conversations amongst stake holders for SWD / B25 will lead to better goal making for individual students.

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. Continue to use District Professional Learning Community strategies during Math instruction.
2. Monitor progress monitoring assessments.
3. Professional Development on reteaching content that students weren't proficient on.
4. Monitor trends in common assessments and discussion on reteaching action plan.
5. Weekly Math tutoring.
6. Teachers will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs and provided actionable feedback as well as Tier 3 teachers provided support through the Coaching cycle.
7. Data Meetings

Person Responsible   Danielle Arbelaez-Willis (danielle.arbelaezwillis@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

NA

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

NA

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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. §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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

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.

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 school culture and environment.

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.