

Orange County Public Schools

# Ridgewood Park Elementary



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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Ridgewood Park Elementary

3401 PIONEER RD, Orlando, FL 32808

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Rebecca Yedvobnick**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2021

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (44%)<br>2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: C (46%)  |
| <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>   | ATSI  |
| * 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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Ridgewood Park Elementary

3401 PIONEER RD, Orlando, FL 32808

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

## School Demographics

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(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><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>97%</p>                |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

With the support of families and 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   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Yedvobnick, Rebecca | Principal           | <p>The Principal and Assistant Principal will provide the vision and direction for the school through shared leadership, discussions, and collaboration with our Professional Learning Communities. They will communicate the school wide expectations for instruction in core subjects and support implementation of effective instructional strategies by observing, providing feedback and coaching to teachers, ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels, ensuring adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicating with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. They will establish clear and measurable goals focused on the critical work of improving student achievement. They will ensure data is analyzed, interpreted, and used to drive instruction. Progress toward achievement goals for individual students will be regularly monitored.</p>   |
| Campbell, Marion    | Assistant Principal | <p>The Principal and Assistant Principal will provide the vision and direction for the school through shared leadership, discussions, and collaboration with our Professional Learning Communities. They will communicate the school wide expectations for instruction in core subjects and support implementation of effective instructional strategies by observing, providing feedback and coaching to teachers, ensuring that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity consistently across grade levels, ensuring adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicating with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. They will establish clear and measurable goals focused on the critical work of improving student achievement. They will ensure data is analyzed, interpreted, and used to drive instruction. Progress toward achievement goals for individual students will be regularly monitored.</p>   |
| Rame, Cynthia       | Math Coach          | <p>Coaches will provide co-teaching and modeling to enhance teacher pedagogy, schedule peer observations, provide professional development for teachers based on needs and District's and school's initiatives, facilitate common planning, coordinate and provide best practices for implementing iReady, coordinate the mentoring program for beginning teachers. Additionally, the instructional coaches will devise a schedule to provide additional support to our targeted students that reflect push in/pull out services for small group instruction and intervention/enrichment. Coaches will provide progress monitoring on targeted students weekly at weekly data meetings, provide training to tutors in working effectively in small groups, administer running records, oral reading fluency, and diagnostic testing, and formulate and monitor groups for intervention based on data. Subject area coaching will create a capacity of reading, math, and science knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy, math, and science concern across the school. Coaches will initiate and sustain change efforts in literacy and math instruction at the school level by analyzing data and monitoring the progress of goals and objectives throughout the year.</p> |

| Name             | Position Title            | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Hamilton, Claire | Instructional Coach       | <p>Coaches will provide co-teaching and modeling to enhance teacher pedagogy, schedule peer observations, provide professional development for teachers based on needs and District's and school's initiatives, facilitate common planning, coordinate and provide best practices for implementing iReady, coordinate the mentoring program for beginning teachers. Additionally, the instructional coaches will devise a schedule to provide additional support to our targeted students that reflect push in/pull out services for small group instruction and intervention/enrichment. Coaches will provide progress monitoring on targeted students weekly at weekly data meetings, provide training to tutors in working effectively in small groups, administer running records, oral reading fluency, and diagnostic testing, and formulate and monitor groups for intervention based on data. Subject area coaching will create a capacity of reading, math, and science knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy, math, and science concern across the school. Coaches will initiate and sustain change efforts in literacy and math instruction at the school level by analyzing data and monitoring the progress of goals and objectives throughout the year.</p>   |
| Scott, Katie     | ELL Compliance Specialist | <p>The ELL compliance specialist will conduct aural/oral language testing on students entering the school and follow-up on students needing the Reading/Writing assessment, assess, evaluate, and monitor the individual progress of each student in the ESOL program, coordinate the re-evaluation (extension of instruction) process of ESOL students and monitor the progress of ESOL students and former ESOL students on a 2 year monitoring plan. She will monitor students' ESOL records and keep them accurate, complete, and updated as required by law and district policy, work directly with the teachers to assist them with ESOL strategies accommodations and interventions according to the ELL language proficiency levels in their classrooms, and work collaboratively with the ELL parents understanding the students' academic and linguistic progress.</p> <p>Additionally, she will serve as the MTSS coordinator. The MTSS coordinator will provide opportunities to build teachers capacities in analyzing data and designing academic and behavioral interventions. Through professional development opportunities, teachers will increase knowledge of the MTSS process and instructional practices. The MTSS coach will monitor data on a weekly basis and facilitate meetings with parents, teachers, and all applicable key stakeholders to analyze student data through the problem-solving process. The MTSS coach will provide coaching opportunities to teachers to increase instructional practice through the coaching cycle.</p> |
| Spolski, Sarah   | Staffing Specialist       | <p>The Staffing Specialist is responsible for monitoring, implementing, gathering information from multiple sources and individuals to meet a set deadline along with adhering to set legal guidelines to ensure mandatory criteria and procedures have been met for students with disabilities. The Staffing Specialist collaborates with School Psychologist, Social Worker,</p>  |



| Name                   | Position Title                     | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
|                        |                                    | <p>ESE teacher, Behavior Coach, District Staffing Specialist, Program Specialist, District Attorney to ensure adherence to federal and county guidelines. She will support teachers and parents with student/family of student needs. She will input meeting outcome data into multiple systems of accountability. She will adhere to timelines when initiating, implementing and following up on meetings. She is responsible for I.E.P creation, adaptation, implementation and compliance verification grades K-5. She will attend M.T.S.S meetings and data collection/analyzing to assist with the progression of student support.</p>   |
| <p>Bearden, Robert</p> | <p>Curriculum Resource Teacher</p> | <p>Coaches will provide co-teaching and modeling to enhance teacher pedagogy, schedule peer observations, provide professional development for teachers based on needs and District's and school's initiatives, facilitate common planning, coordinate and provide best practices for implementing iReady, coordinate the mentoring program for beginning teachers. Additionally, the instructional coaches will devise a schedule to provide additional support to our targeted students that reflect push in/pull out services for small group instruction and intervention/enrichment. Coaches will provide progress monitoring on targeted students weekly at weekly data meetings, provide training to tutors in working effectively in small groups, administer running records, oral reading fluency, and diagnostic testing, and formulate and monitor groups for intervention based on data. Subject area coaching will create a capacity of reading, math, and science knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy, math, and science concern across the school. Coaches will initiate and sustain change efforts in literacy and math instruction at the school level by analyzing data and monitoring the progress of goals and objectives throughout the year.</p> |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 6/23/2021, Rebecca Yedvobnick

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

1

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

8

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

35

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

442

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

16

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

11

**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                              | 28          | 62 | 63 | 99 | 47 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 376   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 8           | 23 | 24 | 37 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 127   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 1  | 1  | 6  | 0  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 24 | 11 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 19 | 14 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 24 | 11 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |

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           | 1 | 1 | 24 | 13 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 70    |

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 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/25/2022

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                              | 18          | 56 | 68 | 69 | 84 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 395   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6           | 21 | 32 | 20 | 28 | 29  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 136   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 5   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 4  | 14 | 28 | 48 | 38  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 132   |

**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 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**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                              | 18          | 56 | 68 | 69 | 84 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 395   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6           | 21 | 32 | 20 | 28 | 29  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 136   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 5   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 4  | 14 | 28 | 48 | 38  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 132   |

**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 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 18 |

**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             | 32%    | 56%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 39%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 55%    |          |       |        |          |       | 51%    | 58%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 50%    |          |       |        |          |       | 56%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 33%    | 46%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 58%    | 63%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 51%    |          |       |        |          |       | 65%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54%    |          |       |        |          |       | 67%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 31%    | 61%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 37%    | 56%      | 53%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 33%    | 55%      | -22%                       | 58%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 47%    | 57%      | -10%                       | 58%   | -11%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -33%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 32%    | 54%      | -22%                       | 56%   | -24%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -47%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 57%    | 62%      | -5%                        | 62%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 63%    | 63%      | 0%                         | 64%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -57%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 57%      | -16%                       | 60%   | -19%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -63%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 54%      | -19%                       | 53%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 5        | 54     |             | 10        | 23      |              | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 27       | 54     | 53          | 27        | 58      | 59           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 55     | 50          | 29        | 48      | 50           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 36       | 50     |             | 37        | 53      | 50           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 27       | 52     | 50          | 28        | 47      | 50           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 12       | 20     |             | 8         |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 13       | 23     | 23          | 11        | 4       |              | 5        |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 23       | 30     | 24          | 15        | 11      | 8            | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 31       | 31     |             | 28        | 19      |              | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 23       | 29     | 25          | 19        | 14      | 17           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 9        | 30     | 39          | 36        | 54      | 65           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 46     | 55          | 50        | 55      | 61           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 50     | 52          | 57        | 64      | 68           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 52     | 60          | 58        | 65      | 69           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 50     | 57          | 57        | 66      | 69           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 44   |
| 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 | 46   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 352  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 20  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 1   |

**English Language Learners**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                | 44 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

| Native American Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students   |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| 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                                    | 43  |
| 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   |
| 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                                | 41  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

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

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

Overall, the trends across grade levels show substantial growth in all categories (achievement, learning gains, learning gains lowest 25%). ELA achievement increase from 26% to 32%, ELA learning gains from 31% to 55%, and ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% from 19% to 51%. In math, achievement increased from 20% to 33%, learning gains from 13% to 51%, and learning gains of the lowest 25% 16% to 54%. Science achievement increased from 12% to 31%. The most growth was seen with student learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math.

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

The component that continues to show the greatest need for improvement in ELA achievement. Although there was a 6 percentage point increase from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022, compared to the double digit increases in all other areas, ELA achievement continues to show the least amount of growth. 2019 state assessment data in ELA showed that achievement increased by a mere 1% overall; from 38% in 2017-2018 to 39% in 2018-2019. There is a need to increase ELA achievement on a much larger scale so that students can successfully read and improve in all subject areas.

Science achievement was the component that showed the lowest proficiency, with 31% proficiency overall. Although there was a 19 percentage point increase since 2020-2021, low achievement in science continues to be a trend. 2018-2019 science achievement was at 37%, 2017-2018 science achievement was at 32%. Students' reading proficiency heavily impacts science achievement. Only 25% of 5th graders were proficiency on the 2021-2022 ELA FSA assessment. As mentioned above, an increase in ELA achievement is needed to support growth in other subject areas.

Additionally, SWD and ELL subgroups continue to show significantly less achievement in both ELA and math when compared with non SWD and ELL peers. Achievement for ESE students in ELA did not surpass 14% in any grade level. In math, achievement did not surpass 17%. For ELL students, ELA achievement did not surpass 30% in any grade level, and math achievement did not surpass 24%.

#### **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 largest contributing factor for low proficiency in reading is the lack of foundational skills. There are significant gaps, especially for intermediate students, when it comes to phonics and vocabulary. This greatly impacts students' abilities to comprehend literary and informational texts. In order to improve in this area, Tier 1 interventionists will focus heavily on these skills with students. We will continue to use SIPPS to ensure our students build a solid foundation for reading. Additionally, this year we will be shifting to providing all students more "authentic" reading experiences. All teachers will have classroom libraries, and there will be a school-wide read aloud initiative this upcoming year. Creating a culture of reading will shift how students think about reading.

As mentioned previously, lack of proficiency in ELA greatly contributes to the lack of proficiency in science. In addition to the actions above to support reading achievement, the science lab will be used on a weekly basis to provide hands on lab experiences for application of science content. We will focus heavily on previewing academic vocabulary and building students' background knowledge to help them



make real-world connections to the content.

To support achievement of our SWDs and ELLs, there will be a heavy focus on building teacher capacity in terms of effective teaching strategies. We will host professional development sessions facilitated by the school staffing specialist, VE teacher, MTSS coordinator, and ECS to provide teachers with information on accommodations, instructional strategies, documentation, and data tracking to support these student populations.

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

Based off of progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, math learning gains and math learning gains in the lowest 25% showed the greatest improvement. Both areas increased 38 percentage points.

Additionally, ELA learning gains and ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% also showed significant increases, with a 24 percentage point increase and a 32 percentage point increase respectively.

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

The main contributor to this improvement was the daily small group instruction that took place both in ELA and in Math. In addition to meeting with their teacher daily in these subject areas, many students also met with Tier 1 Interventionists who targeted specific skills. Tier 1 Interventionists focused heavily on the lowest 25% and prioritized filling in foundational gaps in both reading and math. Additionally, there was a heavy focus on reading strategies this year which allowed our students more opportunities to engage in reading with both grade level texts and texts at their instructional reading level. Our Extra Hour of reading instruction also supported the increase in ELA, with groups changing often based on individual student needs. In math there was a heavy focus on moving from the concrete to the abstract. Manipulatives and visual models were incorporated often to support student understanding of mathematical concepts.

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

In order to accelerate learning in both ELA and math, daily small group instruction will continue to be an expectation. Teacher led small groups allow students to receive targeted instruction based on their individual needs. Daily small group support from the teacher and Tier 1 interventionists will help students accelerate based on their own individual levels. In order to accelerate learning in math, we will be incorporating a school-wide fluency initiative this year. Students show a need to improve in foundational math skills, such as basic facts and number sense. A weekly fluency initiative will provide students in all grade levels opportunities to practice these skills. An increase in these skills will support their achievement with more complex concepts.

**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.**

With new standards in both ELA and math, there will be a heavy focus on professional development through weekly PLCs. Teachers will meet once a week for ELA and once a week for math with their team, coaches, and administration to dig into the new standards and build a shared understanding of what proficiency looks like and sounds like. PLCs will focus on looking at the standards vertically to see what new knowledge is incorporated in each grade level. Teams will discuss the academic vocabulary necessary for proficiency, and will determine instructional strategies that will best support students in processing and understanding new content.

As mentioned previously, to support achievement of our SWDs and ELLs, there will be a heavy focus on building teacher capacity in terms of effective teaching strategies. We will host professional development sessions facilitated by the school staffing specialist, VE teacher, MTSS coordinator, and ECS to provide teachers with information on accommodations, instructional strategies, documentation, and data tracking to support these student populations.

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

One of the additional services that will be provided K-5 this upcoming year is afterschool tutoring. The tutoring model this year will be "acceleration" which will allow us to focus heavily on previewing academic vocabulary. We will focus heavily on previewing academic vocabulary through the acceleration model to support students in comprehension of content. The acceleration model will also allow us to build students' background knowledge to help them make real-world connections to the content. This will aid students in comprehension of subject area content. Tutoring sessions will allow us to preview critical content with subgroups prior to being addressed during Tier 1 instruction. Multiple exposures will aid in comprehension, application, and retention of content. Tutoring sessions will also allow us additional opportunities to build students foundational knowledge in both ELA and math. By filling in foundational gaps, we will better prepare students for success in core content.

**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 Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:**

Student achievement will increase as a result of building teacher capacity in weekly data-driven PLCs, rigorous standards-based instruction in all classrooms, and the use of literacy strategies across all content areas. Consistent collaboration between teachers, coaches, and administration will build teacher capacity and understanding of content standards, instructional strategies, and needs of individual students.

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

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

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

Overall student achievement in ELA will increase from 32% to 42%.  
 Overall student achievement in math will increase from 33% to 45%.  
 Overall student achievement in science will increase from 31% to 60%.

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Leadership will be present and active in all PLCs to ensure collaboration focuses on standards aligned instruction and high yield instructional strategies. PLC agendas and notes will be used to document conversations and instructional decisions. Data will be analyzed during PLCs to determine if additional strategies need to be implemented.
2. Leadership will develop and implement a classroom walkthrough schedule for all grade levels. During walkthroughs specified "look-fors" will be observed and immediate actionable feedback will be given. During these walkthroughs, leadership will monitor implementation of strategies discussed during grade level PLCs.
3. Based on walkthrough data, teachers will be "tiered" and coaching cycles will be implemented based on individual teacher needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rebecca Yedvobnick (rebecca.yedvobnick@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Build up our system of how we analyze data and instructional practices, in order to make necessary adjustments to standards aligned instruction that improve student achievement outcomes. Through weekly, data-driven professional learning communities (PLCs) teachers will have the opportunity to analyze data and instructional practices, as well as use data to determine remediation and enrichment needs to improve student achievement outcomes.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Through ongoing analysis of data and instructional practices we will be able to accommodate the needs of all of the diverse learners at Ridgewood Park. Data will be used to tier students and teachers. Support will be given to both students and teachers based on individual needs. We will use ongoing progress monitoring of individual student data to drive the MTSS process and ensure necessary interventions are in place.

**used for selecting  
this strategy.**

### **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. Meet twice weekly in PLCs to support teachers with content and high-yield instructional strategies. Incorporate data analysis in PLCs to drive instructional shifts.
2. The coaches will provide ongoing professional development on processing and monitoring strategies, as well as content standards. The leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs to gather trends on implementation of the learning during PLCs and PDs. Data from classroom walkthroughs will inform professional development throughout the year.
3. Regularly "tier" teachers and implement coaching cycles based on individual needs of teachers. Analyze walkthrough data and student data to determine the effectiveness of support.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Yedvobnick (rebecca.yedvobnick@ocps.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on 2021-2022 FSA data. There is a great need for improvement with our Students with Disabilities (SWD). SWD show very little, if any, proficiency or learning gains compared to non-SWD peers. This ESSA subgroup has consistently been below the 41% ESSA threshold.

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

50% of SWD will show an increase of at least one level on the ELA FAST from PM1 to PM3.  
 50% of SWD will show an increase of at least one level on the math FAST PM1 to PM3.

1. Hold weekly meetings with the staffing specialist and VE teacher to discuss progress on IEP goals, upcoming ESE meetings, documented accommodations, etc. and making adjustments as necessary based on the data.

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

2. Conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure appropriate accommodations are being implemented, specifically during small group instruction. Providing timely feedback and support to teachers in the appropriate implementation of accommodations.
3. Analyze iReady and common assessment data to make the necessary instructional shifts in classroom instruction and interventions. Analyze attendance data to ensure students are receiving ESE services regularly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

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

We will increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports in small group instruction while implementing the use of flexible grouping. This will be monitored by daily classroom walkthroughs with timely actionable feedback, as well as progress monitoring of groups. We will track student progress within groups and ensure groupings remain fluid to accommodate changing needs of students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Small group instruction helps to differentiate and scaffold instruction in ways that meet individual student needs. Teachers will receive support in implementing these strategies and accommodations effectively. Through the support of the VE teacher, classroom teacher, and grade level interventionists students will receive multiple layers of individualized support.

**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. Meet with staffing specialist and VE teacher to discuss SWD data, review IEPs and accommodations, and create schedule that allows for maximum amount of support in and out of the classroom.
2. Facilitate a series of professional development sessions for teachers focused on high yield instructional strategies, small group instruction, accommodations, documentation, and data tracking.
3. Conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure appropriate accommodations are being implemented, specifically during small group instruction. Provide timely feedback and support to teachers in the appropriate implementation of accommodations.
4. Conduct data meetings after each assessment with grade level teams and ESE teams to analyze SWD data and discuss next steps.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social 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.**

There is a critical need to support our students with their social and emotional learning at Ridgewood Park.  
 Based on 2021-2022 Panorama data, only 59% of students responded favorably to feeling as though they are valued members of the school community (sense of belonging). Additionally, only 46% of students responded favorably to being able to clearly describe their feelings. Only 45% of students responded favorably to being able to keep their temper under control, while only 39% responded favorably to being able to remain calm. Supporting students in their self management, social awareness, and sense of belonging is critical to them being successful academically.

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

The percentage of students who respond favorably to:

- sense of belonging will increase from 59% to 80%.
- describing feelings will increase from 46% to 70%.
- temper under control will increase from 45% to 70%.
- remaining calm will increase from 39% to 70%

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

This area of focus will be monitored in several ways. The school leadership team will do "Walk-throughs" during arrival and morning meetings to ensure Conscious Discipline components are being implemented with fidelity. At the end of each 9 weeks, students will be asked to respond to a short survey where they will indicate their sense of belonging and ability to self-regulate. Data from these surveys will be shared with classroom teachers to drive upcoming topics discussed in their morning meetings. This data will also inform future staff professional developments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marion Campbell (marion.campbell@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

From Conscious Discipline Resources:  
 Conscious Discipline has achieved CASEL’s SElect Program designation, recognizing Conscious Discipline as a leader in impactful social and emotional learning (SEL). Conscious Discipline meets CASEL’s SElect Program designation, the highest designation for evidence-based programs, in the CASEL Guide to Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs. This designation indicates that Conscious Discipline can play a central role in a school’s approach to promoting student social and emotional learning. The CASEL Program Guide identifies well-designed, evidence-based SEL

**implemented for this Area of Focus.** programs that offer comprehensive programming, ongoing training and support, and a demonstrated statistically significant positive impact on student behavioral outcomes and/or academic achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Based on Panorama data, there is significant evidence that suggests that both our teachers and students would greatly benefit from the comprehensive programming and ongoing training and support of Conscious Discipline. Based on the initial two day training, staff has already integrated their learning into their classroom setups and first weeks lesson plans. We will be integrating a Conscious Discipline book study into our professional development schedule throughout the year to allow for teachers to share how they have implemented the Conscious Discipline model, provide refreshers on main components of the model, and get feedback from our staff regarding the schoolwide implementation of this.

### 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. Ongoing professional development on the "Conscious Discipline" model. This initiative will kick off with a two day summer professional development session, followed by a monthly staff book study on the 7 "powers/skills."
2. Daily morning meetings to increase classroom community and set a positive tone for each day.
3. School-wide commitments to "brain smart starts," daily greetings, and the use of a "safe space" in all classrooms.
4. Quarterly student surveys to gauge sense of belonging and self-regulation.

**Person Responsible** Marion Campbell (marion.campbell@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**

In grades K-2, a heavy focus is needed on building students' foundational reading skills. This includes phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary. Student mastery of these foundational reading skills is imperative to them becoming fluent readers with high comprehension across genres. This was identified as a critical need based on the following data.

At the end of the 2021-2022 school year, iReady Reading End of Year Diagnostic data showed:

- 69% of students in Kindergarten were on or above grade level
- 42% of students in 1st grade were on or above grade level
- 34% of students in 2nd grade were on or above grade level and 29% of students were performing 2 or more years below grade level.

As mentioned previously, a heavy focus on foundational skills in the primary grades will positively impact student performance in grades 3-5.

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

In 3rd-5th grade, there is a need to fill in foundational gaps with many of our students. The lack of foundational skills is greatly impacting student's abilities to comprehend both literary and informational texts across subject areas. This was identified as a critical need based on end of year data.

3rd Grade (Current 4th Graders):

- According to the iReady Reading End of Year Diagnostic, 47% of students in 4th grade were performing on or above grade level and 33% of students were performing two or more grade levels below.
- According to 2021-2022 FSA ELA data, 42% of students were proficient (level 3 or higher) and 44% of students scored a Level 1.

4th Grade (Current 5th Graders):

- According to the iReady Reading End of Year Diagnostic, 25% of students in 4th grade were performing on or above grade level and 28% of students were performing two or more grade levels below.
- According to 2021-2022 FSA ELA data, 33% of students were proficient (level 3 or higher) and 44% of students scored a Level 1.

In addition to filling foundational gaps, there is also a need to create a culture of reading and authentic reading experiences for our students at Ridgewood Park. Students must understand the purpose of reading- to learn and gain knowledge. Students need to explore books that are of interest to them and learn to respond to reading in writing.

### **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)**

Based on the 2022-2023 iReady End of Year Reading Diagnostic:

- The percentage of Kindergarten students reading on or above grade level will increase from 69% to 80%.
- The percentage of 1st grade students reading on or above grade level will increase from 42% to 50%.
- The percentage of 2nd grade students reading on or above grade level will increase from 34% to 42%.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 ELA FAST:

- The percentage of 3rd grade students proficient in reading will increase from 42% to 47%.
- The percentage of 4th grade students proficient in reading will increase from 33% to 42%.
- The percentage of 5th grade students proficient in reading will increase from 24% to 42%.

### **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.

Instructional practice related to ELA will be monitored in the following ways:

- Daily walkthroughs during Extra Hour of reading instruction and ELA block by administrators and coaches. Immediate feedback will be given to teachers after walks to inform next steps. Administrators and coaches will discuss trends in weekly leadership team meetings to determine upcoming coaching cycles, PDs, etc.
- Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and learning community leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Yedvobnick, Rebecca, [rebecca.yedvobnick@ocps.net](mailto:rebecca.yedvobnick@ocps.net)

**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?

The evidence based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the outcomes are as follows:

- Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Teachers will use Heggerty to support learning in this area.
- Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words. Teachers will use SIPPS, as well as the foundational slides in the district provided resources (CRMs-Curriculum Resource Materials).
- Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. All teachers have been provided with a classroom library this year, as well as literacy journals for each student. Students will respond in writing to text daily based on the skill/standard discussed each day.

**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?

- The Heggerty program will help students develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. This practice has a strong level of evidence in supporting students with these skills.
- SIPPS, as well as the foundational slides in the district provided resources, will support students with decoding words, analyzing word parts, and writing and recognizing words. These practices/programs will build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words. This has a strong level of evidence in supporting students with these skills.
- In order to ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, all teachers have been provided with a classroom library this year. Students will also be utilizing literacy journals to respond in writing to text daily based on the skill/standard discussed each day.

**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 |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

We will hold weekly ELA grade level PLCs facilitated by the instructional coach and administration. In these PLCs grade level teams will examine upcoming standards, specifically what proficiency with each standard looks like and sounds like. Teams will discuss high yield instructional strategies that lead students to successful processing and understanding of new content.

Yedvobnick, Rebecca,  
rebecca.yedvobnick@ocps.net

All students will utilize "literacy journals" in which they will respond daily in writing to texts. Students will respond to a variety of standards based questions based on texts they are reading at their instructional level. Teachers will provide feedback on journal responses and engage in discussions around grade level standards with students.

Hamilton, Claire,  
claire.hamilton@ocps.net

SIPPS will be used during our Extra Hour of reading instruction to support the acquisition of foundational reading skills. Students will be grouped based on a placement test, and groups will remain fluid throughout the year based on mastery tests at the end of each SIPPS unit. Students will move from the "Beginning" levels of SIPPS to the "Challenge" levels as they work to become fluent readers.

Scott, Katie,  
katie.scott@ocps.net

**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 engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student 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 of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

Ridgewood Park continues to build a positive school culture and environment in many ways. The Tiger Cheer Committee hosts several events throughout the year to support teacher and student morale. The school has a set of schoolwide expectations (PAWS) to build consistency throughout the school in terms of behaviors. This year, we will have multiple community volunteers on campus regularly to mentor students and provide incentives for desirable work ethics and behaviors.

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

A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, engage in professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, 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 school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.