

Volusia County Schools

Forest Lake Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Forest Lake Elementary School

1600 DOYLE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/forestlake/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Sojka A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Forest Lake Elementary School

1600 DOYLE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/forestlake/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>78%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>56%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

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

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.

The mission of our Forest Lake Elementary Community is to provide a learning environment where all students can achieve academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Freeman, Virginia	Principal	Provide feedback protocol to teachers from administration on instruction. Provide and lead with Academic Coaches Curriculum Review/Standards-alignment day's. Continue to provide times for SLT to meet monthly to monitoring implementation, peer coaching, and feedback on student data. Provide additional standards aligned professional learning. Schedule and lead professional Learning on student engagement. Continue working with PLC rubric, outline the norms and roles of each team member, encouraging collaboration.
Sanford, David	Assistant Principal	Provide feedback protocol to teachers from administration on instruction. Provide and lead with Academic Coaches Curriculum Review/Standards-alignment day's. Continue to provide times for SLT to meet monthly to monitoring implementation, peer coaching, and feedback on student data. Provide additional standards aligned professional learning. Schedule and lead professional Learning on student engagement. Continue working with PLC rubric, outline the norms and roles of each team member, encouraging collaboration.
Baldoni, Vicky	Instructional Coach	Provide training to teachers on curriculum resources, online and paper based. Coaches will observe teachers implementing instruction and assessment strategies learned into classroom assignments and assessments using Visible Learning principles. Teachers implement lessons at appropriate levels of rigor and use of math manipulatives where appropriate. Coaches will then provide feedback and support on instruction to teachers. Coaches will use on-going progress monitoring data to drive future instruction with a focus on ESSA subgroups (Black/ African American & Students with disabilities), intervention, enrichment, small/whole groups, and student data chats. Coaches will work with Administration to provide PLC time for standards-aligned lesson planning/pacing/identifying focus standards. Coaches will show and help teachers use Standards aligned technology subscriptions (iReady Instructional, and other standards aligned district offered programs). Coaches will lead vertical learning walks with the purpose of addressing teacher personal growth (at Forest Lake and other schools).
Wagenhauser, Vikki	Instructional Media	Media Specialist and teacher will assist with the implementation of standards aligned technology subscriptions (iReady Instructional, Microsoft, BrainPOP, IXL, Waterford, Success Maker, and other standards aligned district offered programs).
Blum, Hilarie	Dean	Continue to provide times for SLT to meet monthly to monitoring implementation, peer coaching, and feedback on student data. Provide additional standards aligned professional learning. Schedule and lead professional Learning on student engagement. Continue working with PLC rubric, outline the norms and roles of each team member, encouraging collaboration.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Freed, Dora	Instructional Coach	Provide training to teachers on curriculum resources, online and paper based. Coaches will observe teachers implementing instruction and assessment strategies learned into classroom assignments and assessments using Visible Learning principles. Teachers implement lessons at appropriate levels of rigor and use of math manipulatives where appropriate. Coaches will then provide feedback and support on instruction to teachers. Coaches will use on-going progress monitoring data to drive future instruction with a focus on ESSA subgroups (Black/African American & Students with disabilities), intervention, enrichment, small/whole groups, and student data chats. Coaches will work with Administration to provide PLC time for standards-aligned lesson planning/pacing/identifying focus standards. Coaches will show and help teachers use Standards aligned technology subscriptions (iReady Instructional, and other standards aligned district offered programs). Coaches will lead vertical learning walks with the purpose of addressing teacher personal growth (at Forest Lake and other schools).
Anselmo, Kathy	Teacher, Adult	Academic Intervention Teacher will assist with the monitoring and tutoring for lower quartile and ESSA subgroup students.
Boulware, Kelly	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher will assist with the monitoring and tutoring for ESE, lower quartile, and ESSA subgroup students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/28/2020, Michelle Sojka A

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	33	64	63	62	72	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	2	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	1	3	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	3	5	4	5	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	2	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	1	3	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	3	5	4	5	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	56%	57%	56%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	46%	53%	36%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	59%	63%	55%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	56%	62%	60%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	43%	51%	47%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	57%	53%	63%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	58%	-9%	58%	-9%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	54%	-9%	58%	-13%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
	2018	43%	58%	-15%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	59%	-13%	64%	-18%
	2018	46%	60%	-14%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	62%	56%	6%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	43	46	27	54	48	21				
ELL	32	59	57	49	66	52	40				
BLK	24	22		26	59						
HSP	44	65	57	50	54	46	43				
WHT	56	62	68	56	64	40	59				
FRL	48	58	51	52	63	45	53				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	23	20	22	44	30	19				
ELL	31	29	15	29	38	39	38				
BLK	35	25		32	33		38				
HSP	48	40	21	46	44	40	50				
WHT	60	46	24	55	43	29	79				
FRL	51	37	21	48	44	34	58				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	23	23	24	53	42	21				
ELL	38	55	54	38	45	41	45				
BLK	51	52	36	38	52	50	42				
HSP	50	54	41	55	60	37	68				
WHT	61	53	33	58	62	57	63				
FRL	53	52	36	52	58	46	62				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Math iReady data steadily dropped for all grade levels over semester one due to the ELA focus on whole and small group instruction in semester one. ELA iReady data showed improvement but students did not take assessment 3. Our 5th grade science was at 23.71% and in 18-19 our students were at 28.7% satisfactory. Our ESSA subgroups show need for continued support, falling below the 41% marker which reflected in ELA, Math, and Science data.

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

In iReady data, our 5th grade math went from 50% to 11% satisfactory. Including our 2nd grade students iReady Math from 58% to 25%. This can be contributed to the management of instructional time through whole/small group focus for ELA in semester one.

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 data shows our ELA assessment data (17.1%) are behind the district (20.1%) and state (21.7%). For math, our students scoring a level 3 is lower at 20% compared to the district (28.8%) and state (27.3%). In science our level 1 students are high, level 3 are lower at 22.5% (to district 29.7%) and level 4 are 12.6% (district 15%). Our main factor for math (iReady data) and science (district data) falling behind is the focus on ELA instruction in semester 1. Our forward movement was also interrupted by the students gap in instruction during semester 2. Our data shows the greatest gap is in Math with the state +7.3% and the district +8.8%. For science our data also shows the district ahead causing a 7.2% gap with students scoring a level 3.

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

ELA iReady data showed the most improvement because of the strong focus on whole/small group instruction. See every student, every day approach to meet the individual student needs.

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

Students scoring level 1 on assessments are heavy in 5th grade (14 in ELA and 12 in Math). This also means that there are 7 students 5th grade students with two or more indicators. In addition only 5 students were held back, 4 in first grade and 1 in second grade.

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

1. Math; whole/small group instruction, standards aligned instruction, math manipulatives/hands on instruction
2. ELA: continue managing instructional time through whole/small group instruction, standards aligned instruction
3. Science: vocabulary focus, common experiments, science focused activities at lunch
4. ESSA subgroups: focus on providing support through small group time in ELA, Math & science, tutoring
5. PBIS and SEL blend to help students develop social and emotional skills to positively affect student outcomes.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

iReady data 19-20 showed an overall decline from diagnostic 1 to 2. In state assessment data our level 3 were 8.8% below the district. Our level 1 were 5% higher than the state.

Measurable Outcome:

Student performance will show a 5% growth on iReady data from diagnostic 1 and 2. On our state assessment data we will increase students scoring a level 3 by 5%. In addition we will see a decrease by 5% of students scoring a level 1 on the state assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Hands-on, standards based whole group instruction and practice. Small and whole group instruction, intervention and enrichment provided daily. Differentiated instruction through iReady Instructional.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our data shows that students are needing more instruction at a conceptual level. Which tells us we have a lack of hands-on instruction and use of manipulatives. In addition, students who are at the conceptual level need differentiated instruction to dive deeper into the standard. Evidence shows managing instructional time through small/whole group instruction allows teachers to reach the individual needs of all students including our ESSA subgroups (Black/African American & Students with Disabilities).

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers and staff in expectations and different levels of understanding in math. Understanding the curriculum map and standards.

Person Responsible

Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide structure for small groups within the master schedule, set expectations, and monitoring through monthly walk through and PLC data.

Person Responsible

Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor monthly ESSA subgroup data (black/African american & students with disabilities) through PLCs. Provide practice and enrichment for students on or above tier 1. Respond to remediation and intervention for students in tier 2 or 3.

Person Responsible

Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly Instructional Coach guided curriculum overview session to set up manipulatives and plan for instruction.

Person Responsible

Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Through our data we are observing a declining trend in our Science Assessment scores. Our level 3 students at 22.5% compared to 29.7 district and 29.2 state. Our level 4 students at 12.6.% (15% district, 13.7% state). Our level 1 students show an increase of 5% compared to the district.

Measurable Outcome: We will see a 5% movement of students scoring a level 3 or above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: David Sanford (dwsanfor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common Experiments, Vocabulary, Exposure to science based literature, daily standards-based and engaging instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are lacking scientific vocabulary and conceptual information needed to navigate assessments. Teacher misconceptions and need for horizontal progression of standards for planning. ESSA subgroups were identified as Black/African American and Students with Disabilities, show need for standards- aligned instruction and engaging instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Addressing teacher misconceptions and fair game standards. Provide training on standards-based and engaging instruction.

Person Responsible David Sanford (dwsanfor@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Common experiments planned and monitored (quarterly walkthroughs) through PLCs and grade chairs.

Person Responsible Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Increase student knowledge of scientific vocabulary through word walls, morning announcements, lunch activities, and exposure to science based literature.

Person Responsible Vikki Wagenhauser (vdwagenh@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor student data through PLCs monthly. Address ESSA sub groups (black/African American, Students with disabilities)

Person Responsible Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On state assessments we have more students scoring a level 2 (and below) at 27.2% then the district 24.8% and state 23.1%. We also see that we have less students scoring a Level 3 or above compared to the district and state data. ESSA subgroups were identified as Black/African American with 24% in achievement and Students with Disabilities with a 15% in achievement, show need for standards- aligned instruction.

Measurable Outcome: We will see a 5% movement of students scoring a level 3 or above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards based whole group instruction and practice. Small group instruction, intervention and enrichment provided daily. Student Engagement. Differentiated instruction through iReady Instructional.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are are needing more instruction at a comprehension level. Students who are at the comprehension level need differentiated instruction to dive deeper into the standard. ESSA subgroups were identified as Black/African American and Students with Disabilities, show need for standards- aligned instruction, intervention and support.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers and staff of this years best practices (expectations) for intervention and enrichment. Understanding the curriculum map and standards.

Person Responsible Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide structure for small groups within the master schedule, set expectations, and monitoring through monthly walk through and PLC data.

Person Responsible Vicky Baldoni (vpbaldon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor monthly ESSA subgroup data (black/African american & students with disabilities) through PLCs. Provide practice and enrichment for students on or above tier 1. Respond to remediation and intervention for students in tier 2 or 3.

Person Responsible Vicky Baldoni (vpbaldon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly Instructional Coach guided curriculum overview session to set up plans for instruction.

Person Responsible Vicky Baldoni (vpbaldon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our school plans to increase focus on the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and Social Emotional Learning (SEL) to help students develop academic, social, and emotional skills that positively affect student outcomes. School Leadership will create a PBIS Handbook, re-train teachers in Forest Lake's PBIS practices, provide new PBIS/SEL resources to teachers, develop a PBIS/SEL mentor program (based on data showing student need), develop a monthly SEL theme to integrate into PBIS routines and instructions that will include teacher training, continue 'Circle up' practices and use of Sanford Harmony Kits.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Forest Lake Elementary plans to build positive relationships with stakeholders to fulfill our school's mission and support the needs of students in several ways. We plan to host PFEP – Parent Parties, summer media hours, professional development on family engagement, training for parents to use communication systems, and increase communication of Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports (PBIS) to stakeholders. Forest Lake plans to incorporate more Social Emotional Learning (SEL) into the school day through PBIS practices, Circle Up activities, and the use of Sanford Harmony Kits for the teachers use within their classrooms. Forest Lake Elementary also plans to continue partnerships with the community to build positive relationships. One of our staff members is our Business Partner Coordinator and they are responsible for recruiting local businesses and community organizations to form partnerships with our school. These partnerships in turn provide needed support for school programs and enhance the educational program at Forest Lake. For example, student recognition programs are almost entirely funded through partnering with local business and community groups. Throughout the year, business partners are invited to participate in various school events to show support, raise awareness, and provide resources to help raise student achievement. Forest Lake Elementary also has a strong and active Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) which brings together parents, teachers, and members of the community to support our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00