

Orange County Public Schools

# Arbor Ridge K 8



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Arbor Ridge K 8

2900 LOGANDALE DR, Orlando, FL 32817

<https://arborridgek8.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Vanessa Demars**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (74%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Arbor Ridge K 8

2900 LOGANDALE DR, Orlando, FL 32817

<https://arborridgek8.ocps.net/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>78%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>70%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	A	A	A

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

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

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

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
DeMars, Vanessa	Principal	<p>The members of the Arbor Ridge Leadership Team are: Vanessa DeMars, Principal; Gloria T. Riley, Assistant Principal; Jennifer George, Instructional/ Reading Coach; Tammy Carver, SAFE Coordinator; Mary Ellen Jackson, Guidance Counselor; Lori Harding, Staffing Specialist; Tonja Doering, Media Specialist; Dave Cross, PASS Coordinator; Christopher Pelan, Administrative Dean and Tammy Tannehill School Assessment Coordinator.</p> <p>Our administrative team is focused on advancing student and staff learning, they lead the way in helping teachers provide rigorous standards-based instruction to ensure that students achieve the intended outcomes of their schooling. When we meet as a leadership team we asked ourselves to what extent are the students learning the standards of each grade level or course and what steps can we, as a leadership team, take to give both the students and the teachers the additional time and support they need to improve student learning. Our administrative team is committed to providing teachers quality feedback on the Marzano Framework for Teaching and Learning. This feedback is centered on the essential elements in Domain I and the teacher's progress toward achieving the desired effect of each element. During pre and post observation conferences, the administrative team is looking for a student-centered classroom where students are challenged to think in cognitively complex ways. The remaining members of the leadership team serve in resource roles to support student learning. Our Administration shares responsibility for student discipline K-8 to ensure fair and consistent implementation of the OCPS Code of Student Conduct. Additionally, they meet monthly as a Threat Assessment Team to address student safety concerns.</p> <p>Assistant Principal, Gloria T. Riley serves as the Magnet Coordinator for the Arbor Ridge Middle Years Program. Our Instructional Coach uses data gathered during her classroom walk-throughs to provide coaching, model lessons, design professional development, and guide the teachers as they make instructional changes related to student achievement. She leads our teachers in the implementation of B.E.S.T. Standards. In addition, she is able to coach the teachers on planning instruction where all students able to access the core either through remediation or enrichment. She assists the teachers with embedding rigor in to their instruction and assessment. Tammy Tannehill serves as the school assessment coordinator and assist teachers with accessing student assessment data through the various OCPS platforms. The Instructional Leadership Team meets with grade level teams weekly to review student assessment data, scope and sequence and digital learning to make instructional changes to enhance student learning. To ensure the instructional needs of our ESE students are being met, our staffing specialist work with the ESE staff to determine the most appropriate placement for each individual student. Our guidance counselor and SAFE coordinator are devoted to meeting the social and emotional needs of our student and their families. Making sure students feel safe and are ready to learn. Our Guidance counselor is also the 504 Plan Coordinator ensuring students' plans are reviewed annually and students are receiving their individualized accommodations. Media specialist, promotes and supports literacy throughout the school via the 21st Century Learning Skills. She along with Assistant Principal Riley, Tonja Doering, Jennifer George, PLTW instructor Ms. Neff, and 3rd grade teacher Ms. McCabe, make up the Digital Literacy Team. Our PASS</p>



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Coordinator manages the Alternative to Suspension Classroom or PASS program which is a short-term on-site intervention classroom initiative designed to address the unique needs of students who have committed a school level behavioral infraction.
Riley, Gloria	Assistant Principal	
Carver, Tammy	Other	
Cross, David	Other	
George, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Jackson, Mary Ellen	School Counselor	
Harding, Lori	Staffing Specialist	

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 6/29/2020, Vanessa Demars

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

21

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

67

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

778

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

2

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

9

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	80	65	83	99	62	78	90	99	84	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	7	20	15	14	15	8	16	9	9	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	10	9	8	11	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	14	14	8	3	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	12	10	8	9	3	0	0	0	0	42

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 12/22/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	57%	55%				76%	62%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						70%	60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						60%	55%	54%
Math Achievement	78%	41%	42%				80%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	76%						70%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						62%	54%	52%
Science Achievement	66%	57%	54%				71%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	63%	59%				99%	74%	78%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
06	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	80%	52%	28%	54%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
07	2022					
	2019	91%	48%	43%	52%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
08	2022					
	2019	91%	54%	37%	56%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	63%	8%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	59%	57%	2%	60%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2022					
	2019	83%	43%	40%	55%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2022					
	2019	82%	49%	33%	54%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
08	2022					
	2019	82%	36%	46%	46%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	83%	49%	34%	48%	35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	66%	33%	71%	28%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	63%	36%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29	44	35	35	53	50	23				

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
ELL	51	60	39	64	62	50	36				
ASN	85	76		91	76		82		69		
BLK	64	56	46	70	72	57	61	90			
HSP	61	57	43	74	76	66	62	81	59		
MUL	57			71							
WHT	71	50	23	81	78	82	67	77	74		
FRL	56	59	43	64	68	57	52	64	54		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	25	41	41	39	46	36	19	50			
ELL	65	68	67	69	64	40	67				
ASN	89	84		91	88		94		85		
BLK	64	51	36	70	54	42	71	60	70		
HSP	67	67	54	71	60	55	67	79	69		
WHT	77	65	46	80	61	58	79	77	75		
FRL	66	66	53	69	57	50	65	68	70		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	52	52	40	58	50	41				
ELL	64	65	68	70	66	57	67	90	73		
ASN	92	79		98	87		94		100		
BLK	66	62	50	68	65	50	50				
HSP	68	64	60	71	65	59	65	98	87		
MUL	91			82							
WHT	83	76	61	88	74	73	75	100	94		
FRL	71	65	57	72	68	59	65	98	87		

**ESSA Data Review**

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	659
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	65
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0



Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The emerging trend across grade levels that displays the greatest area of growth is Math. Overall, Arbor Ridge K-8 increased 2 percentile points which eliminated the previous trend of decreasing 2 percentile points. In addition to the overall percentage of students demonstrating proficiency, we also increased an impressive percentile points in learning gains. In 2021, our learning gains were 62% and for the 2022 our learning gains were 76% which is an increase 14 percentile points. However, in ELA the emerging trend displays an average decrease of 7 percentile points in grades 3, 5, 6 and 7. The grade levels that showed growth were 4th and 8th with an average increase of 4.5 percentile points. In addition, ELA overall percentage demonstrating proficiency decreased 6 percentile points from 2021 (73%) and 2022 (67%). Learning gains decreased by 9 percentile and the bottom quartile decreased by 10 percentile points. In 2021 (66%) made learning gains and in 2022 (57%) and the bottom quartile 2021 (49%) made learning gains and in 2022 (39%).

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

Our greatest need for improvement is ELA. This was determined after digesting our progress monitoring data components such as: iReady, PMA-1-PMA-3 and our 2022 state assessments which are: FSA, EOC and Science Norm Reference. Our 2022 FSA-ELA data shows that the average percent of students scoring on proficiency decreased 7 percentile points in grades 3, 5, 6 and 7. In addition, ELA overall percentage demonstrating proficiency decreased 6 percentile points from 2021 (73%) and 2022 (67%). Learning gains decreased by 9 percentile points and the bottom quartile decreased by 10 percentile points. In 2021 (66%) made learning gains and in 2022 (57%) and the bottom quartile 2021 (49%) made learning gains and in 2022 (39%).

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

The interruption of learning due to COVID continues to be a contributing factor. The 2021-2022 school year was the students first year back to face to face learning which was an uneasy transition for many students socially, emotionally and academically. For the 2022-2023 school year, we must focus on best practices in early literature development across content areas, implementation of K-8 B.E.S.T. Standards and closely progress monitoring our bottom quartile in ELA.

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

Math data showed the most improvement. Overall, we increased 2 percentile points of students demonstrating proficiency in comparison to the 2021 FSA Math data and the 2022 FSA Math data which eliminated the previous trend of decreasing 2 percentile points. In addition to the overall percentage of students demonstrating proficiency, we also increased the percentage of points in learning gains. In 2021, our learning gains were 62% and 2022 are learning gains were 76% which is an increase 14 percentile points. Our learning gains of our bottom quartile in math also increased by 14 percentile points starting at 55% (2021) and increasing to 69% (2022).

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

Accelerated professional development in math as well as accelerating tutoring in Math played a huge role in the overall academic growth in Math.

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

Will will continue to provide accelerated tutoring and implement our progress monitoring plan that supports FAST PM1 and PM2.

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

Professional development will include B.E.S.T. Standards for Math and ELA which would include CRM's focusing on how to meet the B.E.S.T. standards. In addition, the new Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will provide professional developments based on the need of the teachers and students.

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

The master schedule is designed for all students to receive their required ELA and Math interventions and enrichments as well as tiered instructional time.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:**

Increasing the percentage of students reaching their proficiency level in ELA is a critical area due to the fact that our students performed the lowest in in the academic area of ELA.

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Data supports the need to focus on ELA. Historically, ELA has continued to decrease slightly every year however, 2021 to 2022 data shows a drop of 9 percentile points. Not only did we drop overall proficiency, but in our learning gains as well.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

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

By focusing on best practices in early literature development across content areas, implementation of K-8 B.E.S.T. Standards and closely progress monitoring our bottom quartile in ELA, it is expected to increase the students proficiency level by 5 percentile points.

**Monitoring:**

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

The instructional leadership team will attend common planning meetings, data meetings and regularly visit classrooms and provide actionable feedback and model lessons as needed. Teachers will attend professional developments such as: Orton Gillingham, K-8 ELA B.E.S.T. Standards and Best Practices Early Literature Skills.

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Vanessa DeMars (vanessa.demars@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

One of the evidence based strategy/approach that will be used is Orton–Gillingham which is a structured literacy approach that focuses on breaking reading and spelling down into smaller skills involving letters and sounds and then building on these skills over time. In addition to, "Science of Reading" which focuses of the five reading components: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Lastly, Best Practices in Early Literacy Skill Development will be an area of focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Orton-Gillingham approach, Science of Reading and Practices in Early Literacy Skill Development has one powerful thing in common which is building on the foundation of reading in digestible chunks during small group instruction. However, Practices in Early Literacy Skill Development addresses those foundational skills across different curriculum areas. K-8 B.E.S.T. Standards training will be provided as well.

### 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.

First step will be providing additional professional developments in the evidence based strategies: Orton-Gillingham approach, Science of Reading and Practices in Early Literacy Skill Development based on which strategy best supports the needs of the students. All teachers will be trained in K-8 B.E.S.T. Standards as we transition to the new required standard in Florida. Once teachers are trained, they will be provided time to implement model and share their takeaways within their PLC's with fidelity.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer George (jennifer.george@ocps.net)

The instructional leadership team will attend common planning meetings, data meetings and regularly visit classrooms and provide actionable feedback and model lessons as needed.

**Person Responsible** Vanessa DeMars (vanessa.demars@ocps.net)

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the Panorama Student Survey, 67% of our elementary students rated positive in Sense of Belonging which is a decrease of 3 percentile points from the previous school year. In addition, the Panorama Student Survey reveals that 50% of our middle school students rated positive in Sense of Belonging which is an increase of 2 percentile points.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Based on the Panorama Student Survey, elementary students will rate favorable 70% in Sense of Belonging and our middle school students will rate favorable 53% in Sense of Belonging.

**Monitoring:**

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

SEL team will regularly meet and visit classrooms to monitor CASEL instruction, provide coaching and support to our teachers.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tammy Carver (tammy.carver@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Embedded SEL competencies in classroom instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

By embedding the CASEL 5 competencies: self awareness, self management, social awareness, relationship skills and responsible decision-making in classroom instruction, students' overall well-being and sense of belonging will increase. Additionally, we will monitor students' social and emotional well-being by addressing students' progress in grade level data meetings.

**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.

CASEL competencies will be embedded into classroom instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Tammy Carver (tammy.carver@ocps.net)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

NA

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

NA

### Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

#### **Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

NA

#### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

NA

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

NA



## Positive Culture & Environment

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

### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools must engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for students' success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture and social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school which includes a mental health designee attend this district wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as our Parent Academy. School utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school.

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

The SEL school team, which includes administration, guidance counselor and SAFE coordinator, will be implementing several initiatives to promote a positive culture.