# Waterbridge Elementary School

**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Waterbridge Elementary

11100 GALVIN DR, Orlando, FL 32837

https://waterbridgees.ocps.net/

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|---|---|---|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## 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 Department 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.

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

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

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

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

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

## School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Dock, Arsha | Principal | The principal supervises the daily operations of the school. She provides a safe learning environment, monitors all student data, and ensures the implementation of best instructional practices and pedagogy. The principal also monitors instruction and data and provides effective and timely feedback for improving classroom instruction, while monitoring the effectiveness of MTSS, ELL, and ESE strategies and support. |
| Delvillar, Angela | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal helps with supervising the daily operations of the school and also provides a safe learning environment, monitors all student data, and ensures the implementation of best instructional practices and pedagogy. Along with the principal, the assistant principal also monitors instruction, data, and provides effective and timely feedback for improving classroom instruction, while monitoring the effectiveness of MTSS, ELL, and ESE strategies and support. |
| Perry, Tiffany | Instructional Coach | The instructional coach provides ongoing professional development and feedback, coaching support, and resources to teachers through the coaching cycle as it pertains to pedagogy and instruction. |
| Karim, Jennifer | Curriculum Resource Teacher | The resource teacher provides instructional support for all teachers through training, coaching cycles, and peer teaching. The resource teacher also assists teachers with the MTSS process and tracking student's progress and data. |

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The leadership team, school-based staff, family, and community stakeholders were involved in creating the school improvement plan by discussing areas of strength and improvement. Once discussed, the team developed school improvement goals and will continue to revise with the support of the School Advisory Council.

**SIP Monitoring**
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored by the principal and leadership team who will revise the plan as needed. Monitoring will occur through reflection of data from FAST PMs, Progress Monitoring Assessments, STAR Reading, Standards-Based Unit Assessments, and Panorama Surveys.

| Demographic Data | |
|---|---|
| Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 | |
| **2023-24 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 |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 88% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 100% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | Yes |
| **ESSA Identification** *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| **School Grades History** *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 2019-20: C |

|  | 2018-19: C |
|  | 2017-18: B |
| **School Improvement Rating History** |  |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** |  |

## Early Warning Systems

**Using 2022-23 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** |  |
| Absent 10% or more days | 3 | 28 | 24 | 16 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 34 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 30 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 14 | 18 | 29 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 35 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 13 | 23 | 31 | 26 | 9 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 8 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 13 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 10 | 28 | 63 | 12 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 9 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 13 | 23 | 31 | 26 | 9 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 8 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 13 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 10 | 28 | 63 | 12 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 9 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 58 | 57 | 53 | 49 | 56 | 56 | 44 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 58 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53 | | | 54 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 58 | 60 | 59 | 53 | 46 | 50 | 42 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 44 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 58 | | | 38 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 72 | 63 | 54 | 52 | 61 | 59 | 45 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 59 | 59 | 59 | 67 | | | 52 | | |

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 291 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 459 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

## ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 28 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 56 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 59 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | | | |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 33 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 56 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | |
| BLK | 51 | | | |
| HSP | 59 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | | | |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

## Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 58 | | | 58 | | | 72 | | | | | 59 |
| SWD | 16 | | | 24 | | | 30 | | | | 5 | 64 |
| ELL | 57 | | | 56 | | | 67 | | | | 5 | 59 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | | | 42 | | | 42 | | | | 5 | 90 |
| HSP | 58 | | | 58 | | | 74 | | | | 5 | 57 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | | | 62 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| FRL | 55 | | | 58 | | | 69 | | | | 5 | 54 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 49 | 61 | 53 | 53 | 66 | 58 | 52 | | | | | 67 |
| SWD | 21 | 37 | 38 | 23 | 43 | 38 | 33 | | | | | |
| ELL | 47 | 65 | 55 | 54 | 63 | 56 | 39 | | | | | 67 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | 80 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 65 | 70 | 41 | 61 | 47 | 38 | | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 61 | 50 | 54 | 66 | 67 | 59 | | | | | 67 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 47 | | 61 | 63 | | 40 | | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 61 | 59 | 50 | 64 | 48 | 51 | | | | | 67 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 44 | 58 | 54 | 42 | 44 | 38 | 45 | | | | | 52 |
| SWD | 0 | | | 4 | | | | | | | | 50 |
| ELL | 33 | 53 | 59 | 34 | 39 | 36 | 32 | | | | | 52 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | 50 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 53 | | 19 | 27 | | 31 | | | | | 43 |
| HSP | 45 | 56 | 50 | 43 | 43 | 41 | 41 | | | | | 54 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 73 | | 67 | 67 | | 64 | | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 43 | | 34 | 39 | 33 | 36 | | | | | 47 |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| | | | ELA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 54% | -4% | 54% | -4% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 60% | 9% | 58% | 11% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 52% | -17% | 50% | -15% |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 59% | -21% | 59% | -21% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 62% | -7% | 61% | -6% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 55% | 4% | 55% | 4% |

| | | | SCIENCE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 59% | 3% | 51% | 11% |

## III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance during the 22-23 school year was students with disabilities (SWDs) with an index of 33%.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

There were no declines in the overall 3 school-wide data components (ELA, Math & Science). All 3 components showed increases. However, when analyzing data across grade levels, 3rd grade ELA proficiency scores during the 21-22 school year was 45%. During the 22-23 school year, 3rd grade

proficiency was 41% which showed a 4% decrease. The biggest factor that contributed to this was the loss of learning which may have caused an increase in reading deficiencies that occurred during the pandemic.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

3rd grade ELA/Reading proficiency showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Waterbridge 3rd grade proficiency was 41% as compared to the state average of 50%. Several contributing factors led to this, which included: learning loss, student reading deficiencies (several students were 1-2 years below grade level), and previous student retention (31 students were retained during the 21-22 school year and were also still significantly below grade level).

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The data components that showed the most improvement were ELA proficiency in grades 3rd-5th and science proficiency for 5th grade. During the 21-22 school year, ELA proficiency was 49% across grades 3rd-5th. During the 22-23 school year, ELA proficiency increased by 10% with a total of 59% of students in grades 3rd-5th.

Science proficiency was our greatest area of improvement with an increase of 19%. During the 21-22 school year, Science proficiency scores were 52%. During the 22-23 school year proficiency scores were 71%.

Actions taken to improve ELA scores: small group instruction, strategic interventions, extended reading intervention time, note-taking strategies, strengthened professional learning communities (PLCs) to include standard and task alignment, tutoring opportunities, and deliberate actionable feedback on teaching instructional practices.

Actions were taken to improve science scores: science "boot camp" tutoring, science learning labs that incorporated investigations and exploration, study island, actionable feedback specific to science instruction, reteach opportunities that focused on specific standards of improvement, extended science block on Wednesdays.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

The biggest area of concern regarding the EWS is reading deficiencies across grade levels. Although the number has decreased since the 21-22 school from 156 students to 95 students during the 22-23 school year, we would still like to see a continuous decline in reading deficiencies.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

ESSA Subgroup index for SWD/ESE students
3rd grade ELA proficiency
ELA proficiency (grades 3-5)
Math proficiency (grades 3-5)
Science proficiency (5th grade)

**Area of Focus**
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

## #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the ESSA subgroup data, students with disabilities (SWD) are not making adequate progress with an index of 33. Waterbridge Elementary will focus on increasing students' proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated lessons.

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

During the 23-24 school year, subgroup SWD will increase from 33% to 41%, which would be an increase of 8%.

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

1) Weekly MTSS and ESE meetings (held on Thursdays) with administration, staffing specialist, school psychologist, social worker, and school counselor.
2) Classroom Walkthroughs with specific focus on ESE strategies and accommodations. Actionable feedback will be provided to ESE teacher and general education teacher to improve practices and ensure all accommodations and strategies are being implemented accurately.
3) Weekly check-ins with ESE teacher to ensure all ESE logs are completed with appropriate accommodations.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

### Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will create and implement differentiated instruction geared toward meeting the needs of their lowest 25%. The instructional leadership team will monitor data from common unit assessments, and implementation of intervention programs such as SIPPs, which is a research, evidence-based intervention.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIPPs is a research-based foundational skills program proven to help both new and struggling readers in grades K–12, including English learners and students identified with dyslexia. The program's systematic scope and sequence provides a structured-literacy approach to instruction through explicit routines focused on phonological awareness, spelling-sounds, and sight words. When used as a core/Tier I program, SIPPS supports the acquisition of grade-level, foundational skills standards. When used as Tier 2 and Tier 3, SIPPS accelerates progress so that students are able to efficiently close the gap and engage in grade-level reading.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

**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.

Ensure all teachers (including ESE teacher) are trained on SIPPs program and know how to implement the program with fidelity.

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

**By When:** September 30, 2023

Conduct calibrated classroom walkthroughs with administration, staffing specialist, and coaches to monitor ESE practices and accommodations.

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

**By When:** September 30th.

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Description: Students that suffer from with chronic absences often still struggle academically and also struggle with developing positive character traits and social development.

Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students attend school on a daily basis and have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By continuing to strengthen our school's culture as it relates to character development and resiliency, student achievement will continue to improve.

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

Our 2023-24 Panaroma survey data will increase by 5% for students as it pertains to their social awareness, sense of empathy, and considering perspectives of others and decrease absences by 3%.

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

1) Review and monitor survey data and results.
2)While conducting classroom walkthroughs and observations, evidences of character education and resiliency will also be looked for. Teachers will receive feedback if needed on ways to incorporate character ed. and resiliency.
3)Monitor student absences. Communicate and develop plans of action with parents of students with chronic absences through our social worker and counselor.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Arsha Dock (arsha.dock@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Caring School Community is a comprehensive, research-based social and emotional learning program that builds school-wide community, develops students' social skills, and enables a transformative stance on discipline.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Caring School Community curriculum is a program that promotes positive behavior and character development through direct teaching of responsibility, empathy, and cooperation, creating settings where students feel heard, known, and cared for. Students become intrinsically motivated to contribute productively to a community they feel invested in, and where they know they matter.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Provide time for teachers to review and discuss the Caring School Community curriculum and determine which areas teachers would like to implement for this school year

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

**By When:** October 31st.

Students will learn about the caring school community, which will be monitored by the instructional leadership team and teachers. Surveys will be used to gather data and will also be monitored by the leadership team.

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

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Resources are funded based on our students' needs and school improvement goals. Only resources and materials that support and benefit our students and goals are purchased.

Funding allocations include:
Personnel
Supplemental Programs
District Purchased programs
Additional materials requested by teachers to support standards-aligned instruction

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

In grades K-2, 49% of students were on track to score a Level 3 or above according to the STAR EOY results (based on 2022-23 data) .
1. In Kindergarten, 54% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY.
2. In First grade, 45% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY.
3. In Second grade, 47% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY

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

The proficiency levels in grades 3-5 were as follows according to the "RAISE Schools Identification 2023-2024" document (based on 2022-23 end of year data):
1. In 3rd grade, 41% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
2. In 4th grade, 77%% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
3. In 5th grade, 59% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

**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 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 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 65% of students in grades K-2 will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

1) By the end of the year, at least 65% of students in Kindergarten will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

2) By the end of the year, at least 65% of students in first grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

3) By the end of the year, at least 65% of students in second grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

1) By the end of the year, 50% of students in third grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of nine percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

2) By the end of the year, 50% of students in fourth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of nine percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

3) By the end of the year, 70% of students in fifth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of eleven percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

## Monitoring

### 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 impact student achievement outcomes.

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

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dock, Arsha, arsha.dock@ocps.net

## Evidence-based Practices/Programs

### Description:
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?

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

### Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The following components of the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Practice Guide identifies strategies when used in tandem with appropriate educational programs like that of Heggerty,SIPPS and Exact Path meet a strong level of evidence to support ESSA subgroups:
-Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)
-SIPPS(Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

### 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 |
|---|---|
| Literacy Leadership | Dock, Arsha, arsha.dock@ocps.net |
| Literacy Coaching | Dock, Arsha, arsha.dock@ocps.net |
| Professional Learning | Dock, Arsha, arsha.dock@ocps.net |

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | $0.00 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |

### Budget Approval

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

Yes