

Orange County Public Schools

Arbor Ridge K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Arbor Ridge K 8

2900 LOGANDALE DR, Orlando, FL 32817

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
DeMars, Vanessa	Principal	Principal, Vanessa DeMars, Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision-making, ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. She ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. Mrs. DeMars ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. She manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials, and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement. Mrs. DeMars communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities.
Riley, Gloria	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Gloria T. Riley, supports the Principal and serves as an instructional leader. She serves as the Magnet Coordinator for the Arbor Ridge Middle Years Program, provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning, and develops documents to monitor data and address areas of need. She ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. She ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. Mrs. Riley ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. She communicates with all stakeholders regarding school based plans and activities.
Jones, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Amanda Jones, supports the Principal and serves as an instructional leader. She provides professional development to drive instruction and improve student learning, develops documents to monitor data and address areas of need. Mrs. Jones ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation. She ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation. She ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation. She communicates with all stakeholders regarding school based plans and activities.
George, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach, Jennifer George, 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 are able to access the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		core either through remediation or enrichment. She assists the teachers with embedding rigor into their instruction and assessment. She provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning, guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met. Develops and facilitates professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies. Facilitates grade level common planning. Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans. Provides support and assistance to teachers. 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.
Harding, Lori	Staffing Specialist	Staffing specialist, Lori Harding, ensures that the school is compliant with current district and state policies and procedures regarding Exceptional Student Education. She supports the staff in ensuring the development and implementation of Quality IEPs and EPs. She provides professional development for all staff in the implementation and documentation required for those IEPs and EPs in collaboration with the ESE teachers and 504 coordinator. She also participates in the decision making for intervention and enrichment, as she collaborates with the other coaches in determining initial eligibility and reevaluation.
Doering, Tonja	Instructional Media	Media specialist Tonja Doering, promotes and supports literacy throughout the school via the 21st Century Learning Skills. She supports District and school-wide initiatives implemented by the leadership and instructional staff. As the leader in the use of technology, she coordinates all digital media, and provides professional development on the use of digital devices for staff, parents and students. Additionally, she facilitates several reading programs and supports the other instructional coaches.
Carver, Tammy	Other	Our guidance counselors and SAFE coordinator are devoted to meeting the social and emotional needs of our students and their families -- making sure students feel safe and are ready to learn. Our Guidance counselors also serve as the 504 Plan Coordinator ensuring students' plans are reviewed annually and students are receiving their individualized accommodations. Additionally they provide assistance and support of implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.
Cross, David	Other	Our PASS Coordinator, David Cross, 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
Jackson, Mary Ellen	School Counselor	Our guidance counselors and SAFE coordinator are devoted to meeting the social and emotional needs of our students and their families -- making sure

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Heintz, Caitlin	School Counselor	<p>students feel safe and are ready to learn. Our Guidance counselors also serve as the 504 Plan Coordinator ensuring students' plans are reviewed annually and students are receiving their individualized accommodations. Additionally they provide assistance and support of implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.</p> <p>Our guidance counselors and SAFE coordinator are devoted to meeting the social and emotional needs of our students and their families -- making sure students feel safe and are ready to learn. Our Guidance counselors also serve as the 504 Plan Coordinator ensuring students' plans are reviewed annually and students are receiving their individualized accommodations. Additionally they provide assistance and support of implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.</p>
Tannehill, Tammy	Instructional Coach	Tammy Tannehill serves as the school assessment coordinator and assists teachers with accessing student assessment data through the various OCPS platforms.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

Arbor Ridge will involve stakeholders through beginning, middle and end of year updates at scheduled School Advisory Council meetings.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards with formal check-ins at beginning, middle and end of the year and revisions will be made as needed to ensure continuous improvement. These check-ins will involve a review of the culmination of classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring data reviews, common planning input, input from faculty during weekly grade level meetings, and formal/informal input gathered from stakeholders. The data will be reviewed at instructional leadership meetings and adjustments to the action plan will be made if data shows strategies are not yielding the desired outcome.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	7	0	4	6	3	6	5	32	
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	0	1	4	0	8	3	20	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	8	0	1	5	0	4	0	19	
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	0	1	5	0	6	1	17	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	6	4	18	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	4	3	7	4	24	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	8	0	7	8	3	13	7	47

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	7	20	15	14	15	8	16	9	9	113	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	3	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	10	4	1	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	2	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	10	9	8	11	53	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	14	14	8	3	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	7	20	15	14	15	8	16	9	9	113	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	3	0	9	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	10	4	1	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	2	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	10	9	8	11	53	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	14	14	8	3	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65	56	53	67	57	55	73		
ELA Learning Gains				57			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			49		
Math Achievement*	79	59	55	78	41	42	76		
Math Learning Gains				76			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			55		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	68	56	52	66	57	54	76		
Social Studies Achievement*	88	68	68	82	63	59	78		
Middle School Acceleration	78	74	70	66	52	51	73		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	54	55	55	59	73	70	54		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	659
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	58			
HSP	64			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	57			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	65			
HSP	63			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	65			79			68	88	78			54
SWD	26			45			33	67			6	50
ELL	51			73			65	73			6	54
AMI												
ASN	75			92			83	90	100		5	
BLK	50			68			57				4	
HSP	59			73			63	79	71		7	49
MUL	63			69							2	
PAC												
WHT	72			86			73	94	79		6	
FRL	53			66			48	81	57		7	43

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	67	57	39	78	76	69	66	82	66			59
SWD	29	44	35	35	53	50	23					55
ELL	51	60	39	64	62	50	36					59
AMI												
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			53
MUL	57			71								
PAC												
WHT	71	50	23	81	78	82	67	77	74			
FRL	56	59	43	64	68	57	52	64	54			52

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	73	66	49	76	62	55	76	78	73			54
SWD	25	41	41	39	46	36	19	50				
ELL	65	68	67	69	64	40	67					54

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	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			52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77	65	46	80	61	58	79	77	75			
FRL	66	66	53	69	57	50	65	68	70			46

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	54%	5%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	67%	45%	22%	47%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	65%	46%	19%	47%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	60%	9%	58%	11%
06	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	47%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	52%	7%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	84%	53%	31%	54%	30%
07	2023 - Spring	78%	38%	40%	48%	30%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	59%	18%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	61%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	92%	58%	34%	55%	37%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	71%	50%	21%	44%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	51%	12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	47%	53%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	61%	27%	66%	22%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Our current proficiency for ELA is the lowest it has been since prior to COVID. ELA grades 3 (60%), 5 (59%) and 6 (59%) showed the lowest proficiency during the 22-23 school year.

The interruption of learning due to COVID continues to be a contributing factor in ELA proficiency. While the 2022-2023 school year was our students' second year back to face to face learning, we continue to focus on best practices in early literature development across content areas, implement Florida's BEST Standards and closely monitor our bottom quartile in ELA in order to enhance ELA skills across grade levels fostering academic growth and achievement.

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

ELA proficiency in grade 6 showed the greatest decline with a loss of 11 proficiency points from the prior year.

The interruption of learning due to COVID continues to be a contributing factor in ELA proficiency. The 2022-2023 school year was our students' second year back to face to face learning. Additionally, our 6th grade cohort from the 2022-2023 school year is lower in ELA proficiency than years past.

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

Our mathematics component had the greatest gap when compared to the state. Arbor Ridge K8 out performed district and state averages on every math assessment at all grade levels. Middle school, 6-8th grade math, is top performing in the district. 6th grade math (85%) was 3rd, 7th grade math (81%) was 2nd, 8th grade math (91%) was 2nd and Algebra/Geometry (both 100%) were 1st in the district.

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

Our Mathematics proficiency component showed the most improvement. Arbor Ridge K8 out performed district and state averages on every math assessment at all grade levels. Middle school, 6-8th grade math, is top performing in the district. 6th grade math (85%) was 3rd, 7th grade math (81%) was 2nd, 8th grade math (91%) was 2nd and Algebra/Geometry (both 100%) were 1st in the district.

Increasing math proficiency is a gradual process that requires collaboration among our teachers, administrators, students, parents and stakeholders. Regular assessment, continuous improvement and a math rich school environment will contribute to long-term proficiency across grade levels. Accelerated professional development in math as well as accelerated tutoring in play continue to play a huge role in the overall academic growth in Math at Arbor Ridge. Additionally, our teachers are implementing high quality, standards based curriculum along with differentiated teaching strategies driven by student data that is reviewed regularly. At Arbor Ridge we integrate math concepts into other subjects, showcasing their real-world relevance.

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

Student attendance is a potential area of concern. We continue to Regularly review attendance data to identify patterns and trends. We use this information to tailor interventions and strategies based on the specific needs of our school community. Building a positive school culture and improving attendance rates is an ongoing process that requires collaboration, dedication, and continuous evaluation of our efforts as a leadership team.

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

1. Positive Culture and School Climate
2. ELA Proficiency - Whole School
3. Increase ELA Proficiency for SWD Subgroup

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After reviewing student data according to the Panorama survey, the lowest scoring topic is Sense of Belonging. This area looks at how much students feel that they are valued members of the school community. One area of focus will be--Seeking to understand students. Only 49% of the students felt that people at school understood them. This is down 7 points since the 21-22 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Panorama Student Survey shows that 49% of the students rated felt that they have a sense of belonging to our school community. This a 7% decrease from the previous year. It is our goal to return to a 56% or higher rating in this topic by next year.

Monitoring:

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

We will dive into Panorama Playbooks, and will consider using activities such as, "About Me" Agreements, Student spotlight, and focusing on building a culture of school community on our campus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gloria Riley (gloria.riley@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

This will be supported by our OCPS student resiliency initiative.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

OCPS Resiliency Days on September 12 and January 11

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

By When: January 11

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Improve student performance for Students with Disabilities in ELA. The rationale is to improve students learning for our students with disabilities in 3rd grade. FAST data shows that 19% of SWD in 3rd grade were proficient in ELA during the 21-22 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current proficiency for students with disabilities in the lowest 25% is 19% in ELA. Our intended outcome is to increase from 19% to 22%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration walk-throughs during intervention and enrichment to monitor instruction. Students will be provided acceleration when appropriate. Data meetings will occur to discuss progress and brainstorm strategies. All faculty members will be trained and utilized to help provide interventions to our students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Jones (amanda.jones@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

To build mastery, Students with disabilities will continue to review and apply earlier grade-level benchmarks and expectations. If skills are not mastered, students will be given instruction and practice opportunities to address skill gaps from previous grades during intervention time and also during specialized instruction. This will be accomplished through use of district adopted research based intervention programs such as SIPPS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Instructional Leadership team will include the interventions on the agenda for our bi-weekly Instructional Focus Grade Level meetings to support teachers as they implement them. The leadership team will follow a schedule to facilitate Collaborative Learning Team meetings and guide the discussion and use of the interventions. School based coaches and Administration will look for evidence of teachers utilizing the interventions as they conduct both informal and formal observations.

Professional Development provided for teachers for intervention programs adopted by the district.

Person Responsible: Amanda Jones (amanda.jones@ocps.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Improve student performance for current 7th grade ELA proficiency. The rationale is to improve students learning for our students in 7th grade. FAST data shows that 58% of our current 7th graders were proficient in ELA during the 22-23 school year (6th grade). The rationale for this identified need is that these students will be required to take and expected to pass the Civics end of course exam. Proficiency in ELA is necessary to ensure student success on this required 7th grade assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current proficiency for 7th grade students is 58% in ELA. The intended outcome is to increase the ELA proficiency of these students from 58% to 62%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration walk-throughs during intervention and enrichment to monitor instruction. Students will be provided acceleration when appropriate. Data meetings will occur to discuss progress and brainstorm strategies. All faculty members will be trained and utilized to help provide interventions to our students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vanessa DeMars (vanessa.demars@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

To build mastery, students will continue to review and apply earlier grade-level benchmarks and expectations. If skills are not mastered, students will be given instruction and practice opportunities to address skill gaps from previous grades during intervention time and during small group rotations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence-based interventions offer a systematic, safe, and effective approach to addressing deficits, improving outcomes, and ensuring accountability and ethical practice.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional Development provided for teachers for intervention programs adopted by the district.

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

By When: May 2024