Water Spring Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Water Spring Elementary

16000 WATER SPRINGS BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

http://waterspringes.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 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, 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
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.
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.
Caldwell, Chase	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.
Farwell, Amy	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides instructional support to teachers and oversees and participates in common planning for our Kindergarten and first grade teams. Mrs. Farwell also supports teachers in data analysis and planning for differentiated activities small group instruction ad next steps in instruction.
Dominguez, Melanie	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach for MTSS leads the MTSS program by facilitating meetings to address the need of students receiving tier 2 and/or tier 3 support. She also facilitates trainings and serves as a MTSS resource for teachers. Additionally, she teaches small intervention groups and progress monitoring for students in Tiers 2 and 3. Ms. Humphreys also supports 2nd grade ELA and 3rd grade teachers with data analysis and planning for differentiated activities, small group instruction and next steps in instruction.
Terrell, Theola	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The CRT serves as the curriculum resource teacher for math and science, coordinates testing and textbook resources for the school. She provides instructional support to our fourth and fifth grades teachers through PLC's. Ms. Terrell also supports grades 4 and 5 in data analysis and planning for differentiated activities small group instruction and next steps in instruction.
Correia, Susana	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ELL compliance specialist conducts and coordinates ELL parent meeting and provides instructional support specific to the need of LY students. Ms. Correia also administers IPT testing to students and serves as the WIDA testing coordinator.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McBride, Nicole	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist provides access to reading and research material through the media center, as well as supports the management and distribution of instructional technology.
Simmerly, Tina	Instructional Coach	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 their unique cognitive, social, emotional needs. She also acts as the LEA for Gifted meetings.
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.

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.

While developing our SIP, stakeholders are included throughout the process. Initially, the leadership team meets to review data, identify trends and establish goals for the upcoming year. This information is then shared with teachers and staff members to solicit their input regarding the identified goals in terms of the school's strengths and areas of growth. Teachers also have the opportunity to provide input on the professional development and support needed. Our SIP is then revised to reflect the feedback obtained from teachers and staff members. During the final phase of the development process, the SIP is reviewed by our SAC.

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))

In order to regularly monitor the SIP for effective implementation and impact of increasing student achievement, the leadership team will complete coaching walkthroughs that align with professional development and SIP goals. Following each walk through cycle, the leadership team will discuss trends and provide actionable feedback to teachers to support their professional practice. Administration will also attend attend professional learning community meetings to review progress monitoring data and solicit feedback from staff regarding progress toward school wide goals. SIP goals will be reviewed following the administration of the MOY FAST PM assessment to make revisions, as needed, to ensure continuous improvement.

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	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	29%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
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	11	67	55	39	39	37	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	8
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	4	28	19	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	25	14	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	20	31	36	28	0	0	0	0	115

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	11	11	13	35	15	0	0	0	85

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	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	8	57	42	41	37	36	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	17	27	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	46	19	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	8	57	42	41	37	36	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	17	27	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	19	18	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	46	19	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	69	57	53	72	56	56	64		
ELA Learning Gains				67			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			33		
Math Achievement*	69	60	59	74	46	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				68			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			26		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	76	63	54	70	61	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	59	59	52			66		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	54			
HSP	67			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	65			

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	46			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	63			
HSP	61			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	57			

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	69			69			76					69
SWD	29			25			25				4	
ELL	54			63			67				5	69
AMI												
ASN	85			85							2	
BLK	60			48							2	
HSP	62			62			75				5	71
MUL	70			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	77			75			81				5	64
FRL	61			56			73				5	69

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	72	67	53	74	68	62	70					52
SWD	36	61	59	38	54	56	21					
ELL	66	65	55	71	69	63	51					52
AMI												
ASN	81	80		86	60							
BLK	65	61		57	68							
HSP	68	66	52	70	67	59	56					51
MUL	78	67		82	83		90					
PAC												
WHT	76	70	52	78	69	60	82					
FRL	63	55	36	64	69	63	56					47

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	64	46	33	63	39	26	49					66
SWD	32			26			8					
ELL	53	37	33	50	21		30					66

					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
AMI												
ASN	62			62								
BLK	45			45								
HSP	59	41	36	55	32	23	48					70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	50		73	52		56					
FRL	48	55	25	47	41	27	33					69

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	62%	54%	8%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	60%	15%	58%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	50%	16%

				MATH		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	62%	17%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	59%	12%	51%	20%

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.

Based on FAST PM 3 data, the overall achievement for Math (72%) and ELA (72%) remained consistent with FSA scores from the previous year. When analyzing PM 3 data for grades 3-5, 5th grade performed the lowest in ELA (62%) and Math (63%) respectively. We contribute this to tier one instruction issues for four of our sections for ELA. Math also faced tier one instruction issues due to having a long term sub. This issue is being remedied with the support of our instructional coach pushing in to provide support and on-going feedback.

When analyzing STAR PM 3 data for Kindergarten through second grade, second grade had the lowest performance with 55% proficiency in ELA and 52% proficiency in Math. We contribute this to the lack of focus on foundational skills in K-1. This year focus has been placed on supporting the foundational skills in these lower grade levels.

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

In the 2021-2022 school year, 66% of ELL students scored an achievement level of 3 and above on the FSA ELA Assessment. However, in the 2022-2023 school year, ELL student achievement scores declined to 46% on the FAST ELA Assessment. Factors that may have contributed to our decline in achievement scores is the influx of ELL students entering our school throughout the 2022-2023 school year.

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.

The largest gap exists with our science component. The the state average was 51% compared to our 78% average. Factors that supported the growth in this area were intentional planning for science small groups and labs based on student data in addition to increased collaboration with district science coaches.

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

In the 2021-2022 school year, 68% of students that took the Science FCAT scored a 3 and above. In the 2022-2023 school year, students that scored a level 3 or higher, increased to 78% proficiency. New actions that supported the growth in this area were intentional planning for science small groups and labs based on student data in addition to increased collaboration with district science coaches.

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

Attendance is a major area of concern along with fourth graders with two or more indicators.

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

1. Small group instruction to differentiate learning for all
2. Using best practice strategies to support our English language learners

3. Using best practice strategies and differentiation for our ESE students
4. Building a positive school culture and climate to unite our growing population

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

Differentiated and targeted small group instruction in ELA and Math are needed to address the learning needs of all students at Water Spring Elementary. Specific attention and targeting of SWD (Students with Disabilities) and ELL (English Language Learners) 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 instructions throughout the 2023-2024 school year, students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade will be at 74% in ELA and 74% in math on the 3rd administration of the FAST assessment. We also expect 80% of students in 5th grade to score at or above achievement level on the 2024 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-the-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 of concepts that are essential to academic success. While our school scored well overall, we need to provide targeted, intensive, small-group instruction that effectively meets the needs of lower-performing students. We will monitor student achievements for the narrowing of the achievement gap through bi-weekly formative assessments and the implementation of coaching walkthroughs. We will utilize multiple data sources to determine the effectiveness of the instruction and adjust instruction as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Dominguez (melanie.dominguez@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.)

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 implementation and determine the next steps for instruction.

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

The school team will use FAST results, paired with DIBELS Screeners, Standards-Based Unit Assessments, PMAs, and other diagnostic tools such as Exact Path and SuccessMaker 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.

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 1 - Strong 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.

1. Analyze data to identify specific areas of needs for students.
2. Provide professional development to acquire knowledge about best practices for small group instruction.
3. Ensure the consistent use of small group resources across classrooms/ grade levels.
4. Conduct coaching walkthroughs to determine trends and areas of need.

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

By When: September 11, 2023

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

Person Responsible: Melanie Dominguez (melanie.dominguez@ocps.net)

By When: September 11, 2023

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

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

By When: September 11, 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other
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.
Given the large size of our school with students and staff, an area of focus is building a more positive and cohesive culture.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
By focusing on this goal, we expect to see an increase in student attendance, staff retention and positive responses on our Spring Panorama stakeholder survey data.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
This area of focus will be monitored through the implementation of stakeholder surveys at various times of the year and EWS data for students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Matthew Hendricks (matthew.hendricks@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.)
In order to promote a positive culture and environment, the leadership team will utilize CHAMPS and PBIS incentives to understand expectations and take pride in their school. Water Spring staff are encouraged to participate in Professional Learning/community building activities both on and off campus and this fosters a positive environment. Stakeholders are invited and encouraged to participate in monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings where community input supports decision making at our school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
The strategies listed above will help to promote a positive culture through consistent school-wide systems and recognition while fostering a sense of community among all stakeholders.
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 1 - Strong 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.
Instructional Leadership Team: Assist teachers in implementing positive behavior support structures (CHAMPS) and modeling positive and supportive relationships and attitudes.
Person Responsible: Antonisha Ellington (antonisha.ellington@ocps.net)
By When: August 10, 2023
Stakeholders are invited and encouraged to participate in monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings where community input supports decision making at our school.

Person Responsible: Matthew Hendricks (matthew.hendricks@ocps.net)

By When: September 11, 2023

Plan for collaborative professional learning & community building activities.

Person Responsible: Melanie Dominguez (melanie.dominguez@ocps.net)

By When: August 25, 2023