

Orange County Public Schools

Washington Shores Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Washington Shores Elementary

944 W LAKE MANN DR, Orlando, FL 32805

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

Demographics

Principal: Nathaniel Stephens

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2015

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (42%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Diane Leinenbach |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | NOT IN DA |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

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.

Part 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 be the top producer of successful elementary students in Orange County Public Schools

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Stephens, Nate | Principal | <p>Principal Dr. Nate Stephens: Provides the vision for the school to ensure high academic achievement is attained for all students. He implements and evaluates programs within our school to ensure that the achievement gap is closing among subgroups. As an administrator, he performs classroom observations to manage and support alignment for student learning. Additionally, actionable feedback is provided to the teachers for improvement of instruction. He holds weekly Professional Learning Community meetings at each grade with the instructional team members and the support coaches to discuss the intensity of standards-based instruction, Tier I and Tier II interventions along with enrichment lessons for students who are working above grade level. All discussions are focused and targeted on increasing student achievement through a growth mindset. Dr. Stephens coordinates the operation and management of all school activity functions, community relations, school budget and internal account management to enforce district policies. He participates in the School Advisory Council (SAC). Dr. Stephens is an active member of the Jones High School consortium where discussions are held with other administrators to assist with meeting district goals.</p> |
| Cieciwa-lott, Rebecca | Instructional Coach | <p>Mrs. Lott, Instructional Coach: Supports the K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the Florida State Standards and Next Generation Sunshine Science State Standards. She progress monitors grade level science content, oversees that appropriate science strategies are being implemented in classrooms as well as monitoring the assessments to ensure that the data reflects improved student learning. Mrs. Lott assists teachers with the implementation of Marzano instructional practices and the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement. Additionally, Mrs. Lott provides guidance for curriculum and instruction and strategies for infusing Science in other content areas such as ELA and Math. Mrs. Lott is a member of the admin team who supports the Positive Behavior Support Program (PBS). She assists the CRT/Instructional Coach with professional development and participates on the School Advisory Council.</p> |
| Williams, Shacaree | Other | <p>Mrs. Williams, Staffing Specialist: Mrs. Williams is responsible for maintaining all compliance and district required documentation for ESE and ELL students. She coordinates with teachers to ensure all exceptional education students are meeting their IEP goals. She also ensure that students with 504's are receiving their accommodations and our ELL students are receiving accommodations mandated by the Meta Consent Decree. Mrs. Williams plans and facilitates 504 and English Language Learners (ELL) meetings, and coordinates referrals and testing schedules for the Social Worker/School Psychologist.</p> |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | <p>Additionally, she assists the CRT/Instructional Coach with standardized testing to ensure proper modifications and accommodations are provided for students with disabilities and English Language Learners. She assists general education teachers in developing behavior strategies/plans to work with potential exceptional education students, or students with general behavior problems using the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process. Mrs. Williams is the Testing Coordinator for the ACCESS instrument and serves as the Parental Involvement Coordinator. She also oversees the implementation of the Parental Involvement Plan, participates in SAC, and assists the registrar with Full Time Equivalency (FTE) when the survey windows are opened.</p> |
| Ellis, Jasmine | Instructional Coach | <p>Jasmine Ellis, Instructional Coach: Supports teachers by providing research-based intervention strategies and instruction programs. Mrs. Ellis models lessons for teachers and provides guidance at Professional Learning Community meetings to ensure appropriate interventions and strategies are being utilized based on student needs. She participates in common planning, coordinates curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, and provides professional development. Mrs. Ellis monitors the implementation of interventions and strategies during data chats, conducts classroom walkthroughs and attends team data meetings. Mrs. Ellis oversees the K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the Florida State Standards and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, plans and implements a school-wide professional learning schedule in accordance with the School Improvement Plan and teacher needs. Mrs. Ellis facilitates the TOPS program, Teachers Offering Professional Support, to induct new teachers into the school culture. She assists with implementation of Marzano Instructional Practices and provides actionable feedback to teachers to promote student learning. She provides support as an instructional coach, conducts inventory and ordering of all curriculum materials. Mrs. Ellis oversees the promotion and retention process, all documentation regarding curriculum programs, and participates in the completion of the School Improvement Plan. Mrs. Ellis also assists with printing weekly curriculum reports and is an active participant in SAC .</p> |
| Murray, Scheryll | Instructional Coach | <p>Mrs. Murray, Math Coach: Supports K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the Florida State Standards. She facilitates school curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as an instructional coach, conducts curriculum materials inventory, and coordinates mathematics programs and initiatives. Mrs. Murray assists teachers with the implementation of Marzano</p> |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | <p>instructional practices and the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement. Mrs. Murray conducts professional development and serves as the Title I coordinator. Additionally, Mrs. Murray infuses strategies for curriculum and instruction in other content areas such as ELA and Science. She is a member of the admin team who supports the Positive Behavior Support program (PBS). Mrs. Murray also assists the admin team with the completion of School Improvement Plan, and assists with the hiring of new staff and placement of teachers as well as participates in SAC.</p> |
| Harper, Monica | Guidance Counselor | <p>Ms. Harper, Guidance Counselor: Ms. Harper establishes targeted groups which focus on specific student social and emotional needs. She manages the Love Pantry, coordinates Character Education programs, oversees the Attendance Child Study and Truancy meetings with the school registrar and social worker. Ms. Harper serves as the Partner in Education coordinator, as the McKinney-Veto coordinator to assist families and students in need. She oversees the Five Star School Award and submissions to the District office, and progress monitors students at Tier II and Tier III for academics and social behaviors. Additionally, Ms. Harper is an active participant in SAC and the Threat Assessment Team.</p> |
| Nobles, Debra | Dean | <p>Ms. Nobles, Dean: Supports student supervision and school-wide discipline. She maintains appropriate records related to discipline referrals and supports the implementation of CHAMPS, which is the school-wide behavior initiative. Mrs. Nobles assists the general education teachers in developing positive behavior plans by implementing strategies that conform to CHAMPS expectations. To build positive relationships within the school and community, Ms. Nobles coordinates the annual May Day cultural event for our students, parents and families. Additionally, she is an active participant in SAC and the Threat Assessment meetings.</p> |
| Slaughter, Evangeline | Assistant Principal | <p>Ms. Slaughter, Assistant Principal: Assists the school principal with curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives in accordance with the School Improvement Plan. She observes and conducts staff evaluations and provides support to teachers. Ms. Slaughter oversees student discipline while maintaining records of all discipline referrals. She supervises students during the instructional day, while implementing and supporting school-wide behavior initiatives. She monitors the progress of the lowest twenty-five percent of students using the MTSS process. Ms. Slaughter coordinates coaching support for teachers utilizing the leadership team and coordinates professional development for non-instructional staff. She</p> |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | oversees student awards and assemblies, after-school clubs, and the Summer Reading Camp. Ms. Slaughter is also an active participant in SAC. |
| Fedrick, Laquanda | Instructional Coach | Ms. Fedrick, Reading Coach: Supports K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the Florida State Standards. She supports school curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as the ELA instructional coach and provides feedback to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the individual needs of students. Ms. Fedrick conducts curriculum materials inventory, assists teachers with the implementation of Marzano instructional practices, and monitors the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement. Ms. Fedrick oversees and monitors the reading assessments and student data. She supports and monitors Professional Learning Communities for ELA, and coordinates the reading diagnostic assessment schedules. She also provides guidance for curriculum and instruction in other content areas such as Science and Math. She is a member of the admin team who utilizes the Positive Behavior Support Program to increase student academic achievement. Ms. Fedrick also oversees the admin team with the completion of School Improvement Plan, and provides professional development regularly to build teacher capacity. Additionally, Ms. Fedrick assists with hiring of new staff and placement of teachers, as well as participates in SAC. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2015, Nathaniel Stephens

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

0

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (42%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Diane Leinenbach |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | NOT IN DA |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 26 | 69 | 64 | 61 | 72 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 364 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 31 | 28 | 36 | 26 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 25 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

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 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 7/11/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 33 | 58 | 62 | 66 | 76 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 383 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 19 | 27 | 17 | 23 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 39 | 33 | 0 | 28 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 45 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

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 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 29 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |

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 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 33 | 58 | 62 | 66 | 76 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 383 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 19 | 27 | 17 | 23 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 39 | 33 | 0 | 28 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 45 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

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 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 29 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |

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 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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 | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 29% | 57% | 57% | 31% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 42% | 58% | 58% | 50% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 52% | 53% | 53% | 48% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 48% | 63% | 63% | 44% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 51% | 61% | 62% | 52% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 48% | 51% | 36% | 46% | 47% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement | 41% | 56% | 53% | 55% | 55% | 55% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 25% | 55% | -30% | 58% | -33% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 55% | -32% | 57% | -34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 27% | 57% | -30% | 58% | -31% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 54% | -17% | 56% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 31% | 54% | -23% | 56% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 55% | -21% | 55% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 51% | 62% | -11% | 62% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 61% | -28% | 62% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 44% | 63% | -19% | 64% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 62% | -9% | 62% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 38% | 57% | -19% | 60% | -22% |
| | 2018 | 43% | 59% | -16% | 61% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -15% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 54% | -14% | 53% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 53% | 0% | 55% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | | 20 | 30 | 24 | 32 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 42 | 45 | 42 | 48 | 36 | 45 | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 42 | 53 | 49 | 52 | 45 | 43 | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 47 | | 35 | 40 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 40 | 49 | 47 | 52 | 42 | 37 | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 5 | 43 | | 27 | 36 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 44 | | 52 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 50 | 55 | 46 | 53 | 39 | 56 | | | | |
| HSP | 25 | 42 | | 19 | 42 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 30 | 48 | 50 | 43 | 49 | 30 | 52 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 47 |
| 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 | 72 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 378 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 21 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 49 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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 |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 47 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 2019 FSA identified ELA achievement as our overall lowest content area. Our school performed at 29% proficiency for 2019, 31% proficiency for 2018, and 32% for 2017. Absent 2020 FSA data, iReady ELA data was used to determine that ELA continues to be the content area of most concern. Our Tier 1 data from the Beginning of Year Diagnostic (BOY) compared to the Middle of Year Diagnostic (MOY) showed an average growth amount of 8%. We also saw the percentage of students in Tier 3 reduce by an average of 10%. We believe the trend data suggests we would have improved our FSA ELA outcomes on the 2020 assessment, but understand that the proficiency levels would still fall short of our desired goals. Based on the available data we were projecting 34% overall proficiency, which would have surpassed our 2019 outcomes.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is overall math performance. According to the available data we were projecting 46% overall proficiency, a reduction of 2%. There has also been a steady decline in overall FSA math performance over the past three years. One of the major factors that contributes to this trend is the lack of a solid foundation in number sense and problem solving. Deficiencies in these areas do not allow students to adequately attack the rigor contained within the grade level standards. Based on our internal reflections, it is apparent that the foci for teachers and coaches during common planning sessions must turn to more effective planning around both pedagogy and monitoring for desired effect.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 Florida Standards Assessment data, the largest gap that occurred when comparing the school to the state average was that of ELA Achievement. The State scored 57% proficiency, while the school had a proficiency level of 29%,

resulting in a difference of 28 percentage points. The contributing factor that led to these trends include the transition from one planning resource to another. Because the two resources were distinctly different, there was a learning curve for the teachers and the unintended side effect was lower capacity as it pertains to the new resource.

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

When comparing our 2018 and 2019 FSA Science scores, 55% to 41% respectively, a negative change of 14% was revealed. With this in mind, the data component that showed the most improvement is overall science achievement. Based on our ongoing Big Idea and PMAs, our students consistently performed in the mid 50's. Utilizing all available data, we were projecting 53% overall performance on the 2020 NGSSS assessment. That percentage would have raised our overall science performance by 12% compared to the 2019 performance score. The growth in science was a direct result of increased classroom support. The additional supports we introduced are: side-by-side coaching support, small group instruction, increased hands-on activities, academic notebooks.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

This year we saw an increase in the number of ELA and Math course failures. Compared to 2019, the difference was 27. Additionally, the number of students with an attendance rate below 90% increased from 113 to 139.

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

1. Math overall proficiency
2. ELA overall proficiency
3. Learning gain performance in 5th grade
4. Increase attendance rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our 2019 FSA Math data shows us at 48% proficiency and learning gains at 51%. 2019 FSA Math learning gains were down 1% compared to 2018 FSA Math outcomes. Classroom observation data revealed a gap in how teachers effectively monitored for the desired effect of student learning. Delivery of Tier I instruction was solid in most rooms, but the lack of in the moment instructional monitoring did not allow teachers to identify and respond to misconceptions effectively. Consequently, we saw an increase in the number of students needing deeper levels of Tier II instruction and/or participating in repeated whole group lessons. This pattern causes a loss of precious instructional time and limits access to meaningful enrichment activities.

Measureable Outcome:

By June 2021, we expect to see an increase of 20% in the performance of students meeting grade level proficiency in the area of Math as evidenced on the Florida Standards Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nate Stephens (nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will intensify our coaching support at the beginning of the school year by strategically scheduling the math coach into prioritized classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The math coach will engage priority teachers in the coaching cycle starting at pre-planning. Once the year begins, our math coach will model whole and small group instruction. They will also observe and provide immediate feedback to teachers during classroom instruction. Observational data will inform common planning with an emphasis on monitoring for desired effect and the "art of teaching."

Action Steps to Implement

Identify and Tier Teachers in Need of Support: Leadership team will discuss all teachers to determine unique strengths, weaknesses, tier level, and areas of focus.

Person Responsible

Nate Stephens (nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net)

Create Coaching Cycle Plans: Coaches will use all available data to develop support plans for every teacher.

Person Responsible

Evangeline Slaughter (evangeline.slaughter@ocps.net)

Review and Implement Coaching Cycle Plans: Principal and Assistant Principal will review coaching cycle plans to ensure that areas of focus, time, and intensity of support is adequate for each teacher.

Person Responsible

Nate Stephens (nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net)

Observe Classroom Teachers: Principal and Assistant Principal will conduct classroom observations and provide timely, actionable feedback to all teachers. They will also organize classroom walkthrough visits with the coaching team to both calibrate findings and determine campus-wide instructional trends.

Person Responsible Nate Stephens (nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net)

Conduct Instructional Debrief: Leadership team will meet each Friday to discuss classroom walkthrough data, informal observation findings, and review coaching cycle support plans to ensure that we maintain a positive trajectory towards our expected outcomes. The time will also be used to adjust plans and foci, as needed.

Person Responsible Jasmine Ellis (jasmine.ellis@ocps.net)

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

Description: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

- Explicit Instruction: We will provide students with tools and a common language to communicate about daily issues in and outside the classroom.

- Classroom Practices: We will continue using, or implement, high yield instructional practices that require students to work and learn together. The emphasis will be on accountable talk, decision making, and making choices about their own learning.

Measureable Outcome:

By June 2021, we expect to see our rating on the Cognia Elementary Student Survey, in the area of "My teachers ask my family to come to school activities.", to increase from 68% to 80%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Evangeline Slaughter (evangeline.slaughter@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Strategy Selection: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change.

Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies: The Leadership Team and SEL Site Team members will work collaboratively to deepen our overall knowledge of SEL using the CASEL frameworks to enhance relationships between the school, students, and families.

Person Responsible Nate Stephens (nathaniel.stephens@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We are working to increase the number of parents, families, and community stakeholders that participate in events held on campus. In an effort to improve system practices and engage our community, we conducted the Cognia survey then reviewed the final results with our School Advisory Council. We will use the results to bridge the responsibility of student learning with parents, teachers and community partners. Research says that when parents are engaged in their children's school lives, students have the home support and knowledge they need to not only finish their assignments, but also develop a lifelong love of learning. This includes problem-solving skills and intergender communication and understanding, as well as embracing diversity. This school year, Washington Shores Elementary will provide interactive lessons using the Sanford Harmony curriculum. These lessons will help students recognize and appreciate one another's similarities and differences while promoting a community environment in and outside of the classroom. We believe the resources embedded in the social and emotional learning (SEL) curriculum will assist with building positive classroom communities which will continue teaching students to accept each other's differences at an early age which will develop a globalized society. In order to increase the rate of attendance so that more families are involved in displaying support of the school, we send out messages using School Messenger, Class Dojo, and school newsletters. Invitations will be extended to stakeholders to continue participating in events such as Meet the Teacher, Open House, the School Advisory Council (SAC), report card conferences, and school curriculum nights.

Additionally, our school is staffed with a Parent Engagement Liaison, who is the link between the school and our community.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.