Forest Lake Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 8/9/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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.](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

Forest Lake Elementary School

1600 DOYLE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Freeman, Virginia	Principal	Provide feedback protocol to teachers from administration on instruction. Provide and lead with Academic Coaches curriculum, planning, and data review days. 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 teacher clarity, small group instruction, and AVID strategies. 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, planning, and data review days. 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 teacher clarity, small group instruction, and AVID strategies. 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, and provide feed back and provide support on instruction and strategies implemented from our work with Teacher Clarity and AVID Elementary implementation. Teachers will implement lessons at appropriate levels of rigor and use manipulatives and hands on activities where appropriate. 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 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 (new curriculum resources, iReady Instructional, and other standards aligned district offered programs). Coaches will lead vertical learning walks with the purpose of addressing teacher personal growth.
Freed, Dora	Instructional Coach	Provide training to teachers on curriculum resources, online and paper based. Coaches will observe teachers implementing instruction and assessment, and provide feed back and provide support on instruction and strategies implemented from our work with Teacher Clarity and AVID Elementary implementation. Teachers will implement lessons at appropriate levels of rigor and use manipulatives and hands on activities where appropriate. 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 data chats. Coaches will work with Administration to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		provide PLC time for standards-aligned lesson planning/pacing/ identifying focus standards. Coaches will show and help teachers use Standards aligned technology subscriptions (new curriculum resources, iReady Instructional, and other standards aligned district offered programs). Coaches will lead vertical learning walks with the purpose of addressing teacher personal growth.
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 Teacher Clarity and Avid strategies. Continue working with PLC rubric, outline the norms and roles of each team member, encouraging collaboration. Coordinate Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, and monitor student discipline data with AP. Lead with Avid team to provide professional learning on new Avid structure, strategies, and cultural shift.
Wagenhauser, Vikki	Instructional Media	Media Specialist and teacher will assist with the implementation of standards aligned technology subscriptions (iReady Instructional, Microsoft, and other standards aligned district offered programs). Including providing science based literature selections and media lessons connected with fair game standards.
Anselmo, Kathy	Other	Academic Intervention Teacher will assist with the monitoring and tutoring for lower quartile and ESSA subgroup students.
Grant, Bridgette	Teacher, K-12	Teacher will assist in monitoring progress monitoring for all students. Data monitoring will also include ESE, lower quartile, and ESSA subgroup students. Teacher will lead Avid strategies and provide support to other teachers on campus.
Boulware, Kelly	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher will assist with the monitoring and tutoring for ESE, lower quartile, and ESSA subgroup students.
Diamond, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Teacher will assist in monitoring progress monitoring for all students. Data monitoring will also include ESE, lower quartile, and ESSA subgroup students. Teacher will lead Avid strategies and provide support to other teachers on campus.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/9/2021, 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
47

Total number of students enrolled at the school
475

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	60	55	84	72	78	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	11	13	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Saturday 8/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	33	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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	33	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

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				50%	56%	57%	53%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	56%	58%	41%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	46%	53%	22%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	59%	63%	50%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	56%	62%	43%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	43%	51%	31%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	57%	53%	64%	58%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	49%	58%	-9%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	59%	-13%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

For 1st through 4th grades, ELA iReady Diagnostics (1-3) and Math iReady Diagnostics (1-3) were used. For 5th grade ELA iReady Diagnostics (1-3) and Math iReady Diagnostics (1-3) were used in addition to Volusia Science Tests (1-3).

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17 / 19.72%	73 / 47.95%	77 / 58.44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52 / 11.54%	52 / 38.46%	56 / 50%
	Students With Disabilities	15 / 6.67%	15 / 33.33%	16 / 43.75%
	English Language Learners	17 /11.76%	17 / 35.29%	18 / 55.56%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69 / 20.29%	73 / 39.73%	78 / 66.67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51 / 15.69%	52 / 30.77%	56 / 57.14%
	Students With Disabilities	14 / 21.43%	16 / 25%	18 / 44.44%
	English Language Learners	17 / 11.76%	17 / 23.53%	17 / 42.53%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79 / 35.44%	75 / 49.33%	77 / 64.94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65 / 35.38%	62 / 46.77%	63 / 65.08%
	Students With Disabilities	12 / 8.33%	11 / 9.09%	13 / 23.08%
	English Language Learners	14 / 0%	12 / 25%	13 / 30.77%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76 / 25%	75 / 34.67%	77 / 54.55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62 / 27.42%	62 / 29.03%	61 / 54.10%
	Students With Disabilities	12 / 0%	11 / 0%	14 / 28.57%
	English Language Learners	14 / 7.14%	12 / 0%	13 / 38.46

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69 / 56.52%	71 / 61.97%	78 / 70.51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58 / 55.17%	60 / 58.33%	60 / 68.33%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 18.18%	12 / 16.67%	12 / 16.67%
	English Language Learners	19 / 42.11%	19 / 57.89%	22 / 54.55%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66 / 21.21%	67 / 40.30%	68 / 54.41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56 / 19.64%	56 / 35.71%	55 / 50.91%
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 10%	11 / 9.09%	12 / 16.67%
	English Language Learners	18 / 16.67%	19 / 36.84%	20 / 50.00%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	87 / 45.98%	90 / 52.22%	87 / 51.72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62 / 43.55%	64 / 50%	61 / 45.90%
	Students With Disabilities	12 / 0%	13 / 23.08%	13 / 7.69%
	English Language Learners	22 / 31.82%	24 / 45.83%	22 / 54.55%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86 / 24.42%	87 / 50.57%	87 / 54.02%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62 / 24.19%	62 / 48.39%	58 / 55.17%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 0%	12 / 16.67%	15 / 6.67%
	English Language Learners	22 / 31.82%	23 / 39.13%	23 / 39.13%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86 / 36.36%	91 / 39.39%	88 / 39.58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71 / 34.25%	74 / 37.50%	71 / 41.77%
	Students With Disabilities	13 / 15.38%	15 / 18.75%	13 / 13.33%
	English Language Learners	18 / 27.78%	20 / 27.27%	20 / 27.27%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83 / 21.69%	91 / 37.36%	79 / 60.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68 / 19.12%	75 / 37.33%	64 / 59.38%
	Students With Disabilities	11 / 18.18%	16 / 12.50%	11 / 54.55%
	English Language Learners	17 / 11.76%	19 / 31.58%	17 / 47.06%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	325 / 44%	311 / 64%	183 / 69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	269 / 47%	258 / 62%	151 / 71%
	Students With Disabilities	35 / 33%	47 / 58%	26 / 64%
	English Language Learners	74 / 29%	70 / 42%	44 / 67%

Subgroup Data Review

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	18	64		12	55						
ELL	46	47		42	24		33				
BLK	42			27							
HSP	47	59	60	45	31	18	34				
WHT	60	44		51	36		57				
FRL	51	49	43	43	35	29	46				
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				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	56	62	68	56	64	40	59				
FRL	48	58	51	52	63	45	53				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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, our school has shown improvement in ELA and a decline in Math. Our Math lowest quartile students are showing need for strategic targeted support. Even though our ELA lowest quartile students grew from 43% (17-18) to 54% (18-19), they did have a slight drop to 45% in our 20-21 data. Our ESSA subgroup students with disabilities (SWD), have increased in ELA (40% in 2019 to 75% in 2021) and Math Learning Gains (56% in 2019 to 67% in 2021). SWD in our Math lowest quartile have moved from 56% (2019) to 75% (2021). Also in Science Achievement, SWD have climbed 10 percentage points to 68%. Our ESSA subgroup Black/African American (AA), have shown improvement in ELA however, in Math and science still show need for improvement. Our AA lowest quartile students did show a 100% proficiency in 2021.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our Math and Science data demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. Our Math Achievement has steadily declined from 50% (2018) to 47% (2021). Our Science Achievement shows the same decline from 64% (2018) to 47% (2021). Our 5th grade math scores show a significant difference between the district average 49% (level 3 or above) to ours at 35%. In Science we have 42% (level 3 or above) which is below both the State at 47% and District at 54%.

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

Students show need for more instruction on a conceptual level, reading stamina, hands-on use of manipulatives and experiments. This may stem from the ELA focus and structure put into place in prior year and time way from face-to-face instruction. Our new actions include providing instructional structure, collaborative planning, professional learning on Teacher Clarity, manipulatives and hands-on common experiments and new instructional practices through AVID Elementary. Progress monitoring through walkthroughs, data chats and SMART goals will occur through PLCs and discussed in faculty meetings.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our ESSA subgroup data for SWD has shown a jump in math and science proficiency. They increased in math achievement from 19% (2019) to 45% (2021), math learning gains from 56% (2019) to 67% (2021), and math lowest quartile from 56% (2019) to 75% (2021). ESSA subgroup SWD also showed a 10% growth in science achievement from 2019 to 2021. Their data for ELA learning gains went from 40% (2019) to 75% (2021). Additionally, ESSA subgroup AA lowest quartile students, have made a significant push from 26% (2019) to 100% (2021). Forest Lake's overall ELA Achievement has moved from 50% (2019) to 55 (2021).

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

ELA Achievement has shown the most improvement through the strong focus on whole/small group instruction and teacher clarity. Teachers see every student, every day through whole/small group

instructional structures, they participate in collaborative planning, and frequent collaborative data chats. All actions were intended to focus on meeting the individual needs of every student.

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

Math and Science Instructional Structures (whole/small group and WIN time), hands-on learning, push in, use of math manipulatives and hands-on common science experiments, AVID Elementary Learning Strategies in math and science, cultural shift to AVID learning, collaborative planning and data driven decision making, SMART goals.

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

Professional learning in Teacher Clarity, math instructional structure, AVID, gradual release model, SMART goals, and data driven decision making will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

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

Our instructional structures in ELA, Math, and science will be sustained as non-negotiables moving forward. AVID elementary will also aid in sustaining AVID strategies, best practices, and good teaching through Teacher clarity. All of which will be supported through walkthroughs, collaborative planning, data driven decisions, AVID Team and Academic Coach support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our data analysis, our Math Proficiency was at 47%, Math Learning Gains at 38%, and lowest quartile at 24%, which is below the district and state average with a steady decline over the last 3 years at Forest Lake. Further analysis revealed that one of our targeted ESSA subgroup, Black/African American, performed below 27%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math Achievement from 47% to 54%. Increase our Math Learning Gains from 38% to 50%. Increase Math LQ learning gains from 24% to 35%, including ESSA subgroup, Black/African American.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific Math look-fors, and monthly data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dora Freed (dgfreed@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategies are Teacher Clarity, MTSS supports, and AVID Elementary Strategies. We will monitor these through walkthroughs by teachers, Coaches, Administration, and district support members. Grade level teams and teachers will be provided feedback to guide planning and instruction for targeting further student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our data shows that students are needing more instruction at a conceptual level; hands-on instruction and use of manipulatives. Students that are at the conceptual level need differentiated instruction to dive deeper into the standard. Evidence shows teacher clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). Teachers who do this well have high expectations, share success criteria, align instruction with task and assessment, ensure delivery and welcome feedback. Further more, AVID research has determined teaching higher-level thinking and academic habits at a young age creates a ripple effect in later grades. AVID Elementary provides a rigorous learning environment for all students and the common language created empowers teacher and student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with faculty and staff in quarter 1, the data SLT examined that determined the need for Teacher Clarity, MTSS, and AVID Strategies. School Leadership Team will review Data quarterly with staff to support student need.

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

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity, Math Instruction (manipulatives, small group, gradual release, etc), MTSS, and AVID Strategies during scheduled faculty meetings, school based ERPLs and/or Teacher Duty Days.

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

Extended collaborative planning time for standard aligned instruction and lesson planning. Including time to review student data, build small group structures, and plan targeted WIN time/ tier 2/3 interventions, supports, and/or enrichment.

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

Monitor student data through PLC Data Chats monthly and after district assessments to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student achievement. Address ESSA subgroup and focus on students who transitioned from virtual back to face to face instruction.

Person Responsible   Hilarie Blum (hgblum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our data analysis it revealed that our Science Achievement was at 64% in 17 - 18 school year with a steady decrease to 47% in 20 - 21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Science Achievement from 47% to 54%. Including increasing our ESSA subgroup(s); Black/African American by 8%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific science look-fors and fair game standards. Specifically, we will be monitoring hands on science, use of WICOR strategies, and common experiments with STEM class support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Sanford (dwsanfor@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategies are Teacher Clarity and AVID Elementary Strategies. We will monitor these through walkthroughs by teachers, Coaches, Administration, and district support members. Grade Level Teams and Teachers will be provided feedback to guide planning and instruction for targeting further student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our data shows that students are lacking scientific vocabulary, reading stamina, and conceptual information needed to navigate assessments. Teacher Clarity can eliminate teacher misconception, focus standard-aligned instruction, and create engaging instruction for students. Evidence shows teacher clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009) In addition, AVID Elementary provides a rigorous learning environment through the use of WICOR strategies for all students. It also creates a common language that empowers teacher and student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with faculty and staff in quarter 1, the data SLT examined that determined the need for Teacher Clarity and AVID Strategies. School Leadership Team will review Data quarterly to support student need.

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

Monitor student data through PLC Data Chats monthly and after district assessments to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student achievement. Address ESSA subgroup and focus on students who transitioned from virtual back to face to face instruction.

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

Provide ongoing professional learning on standard aligned instruction and fair game standards, 5E Model, AVID strategies, common experiments and manipulative training.

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

Extended collaborative planning time for standard aligned instruction and lesson planning. Including time to review student data and plan targeted tiered support.

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

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

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

Common experiments planned and monitored (quarterly walkthroughs) through PLCs and grade chairs. Including STEM support through lessons and hands-on learning.

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

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our school grade has dropped from B to a C.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall achievement from 45% to 54%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through Volusia County Data Dash Board and classroom observation walkthroughs. Specifically we will monitor school wide structures and instructional non-negotiables in ELA, MATH, and science. We will work to build hands-on learning, use of AVID strategies, and systems for teacher efficacy.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Hilarie Blum (hgblum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will implement Data Driven Decision Making, SMART goals, small group instruction, Teacher Clarity and AVID.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school shows a need to disaggregate data and improve monitoring systems to drive student achievement and proficiency. Data Driven Decision Making when used effectively; uses facts, metrics, and data to develop working systems to produce desired outcomes. SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) goals are developed to achieve desired outcomes. When developed by a team from a data set, SMART goals will drive instruction and raise student achievement. Evidence shows managing instructional time through small/whole group instruction allows teachers to reach the individual needs of all students, including our ESSA subgroup and transitioning virtual back to face to face students.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with faculty and staff in quarter 1, the data SLT examined that determined the need for Teacher Clarity and AVID Strategies. School Leadership Team will review Data quarterly to support student need.

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

Provide ongoing professional learning on Teacher Clarity, SMART Goals, gradual release model, WIN and small group structure.

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

Extended collaborative planning time for standard aligned instruction and lesson planning. Including time to review student data and plan targeted tiered support.

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

Monitor student data through PLC Data Chats monthly and after district assessments to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student achievement. Address ESSA subgroup and focus on students who transitioned from virtual back to face to face instruction.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA Achievement is a fragile B (55% 20-21). In order to see continued growth to an A, we need to continue to provide interventions and supports through standard aligned instruction and whole/small group structures push in model. Our ESSA groups (SWD & AA), show further need in lowest quartile from 59% (2019) to 50% (2021).
Measurable Outcome:	We will see a 5% increase of students in Tier 1 and Tier 2.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA look-fors, and monthly data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vicky Baldoni (vpbaldon@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based instruction, small group instruction (.47 Effect Size, Hattie), intervention and enrichment daily. Avid Elementary WICOR reading strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are needing more instruction at a comprehension level. Students needed enrichment are at the comprehension level and need differentiated instruction to go deeper into the standard. Evidence shows small group instruction has an effect size of 0.47 (Hattie, 2009) ESSA subgroups show need for continued standards aligned instruction, intervention and support.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers on curriculum, continuing structure, intervention, and enrichment. Train and begin implementation of WICOR Avid Elementary strategies through WICOR Wednesday.

Person Responsible	Melissa Diamond (mldiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide small group structure within master schedule and set expectations. Provide training on Avid Elementary expectations and implementation.

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

Instructional monitoring through monthly walk throughs (Admin., Coaches, and District Team) and PLC data.

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

Quarterly Instructional Coach guided curriculum overview and planning sessions. Including gradual release of Avid strategies.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools, the SLT have identified threat and intimidation as areas of concern. It is ranked as very high. Our schools plan to reduce these incidents by implementing the following;

School will:
-train teachers in RULER practices
-identify mentors for students who show need through PBIS Team and SLT data monitoring
-provide discipline data to teachers through a PLC meeting once a month

Teachers will:
-monitor student behavior utilizing MTSS and PBIS
-utilize RULER training and strategies Mood Meter and Meta-Moment when dealing with student behavior
-SEL time will be planned and provided 2 times per week for all students

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.

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 Events, professional learning on family engagement, training for parents to use communication systems and increase communication of our Positive Behavior Interventions and supports (PBIS) and Avid programs. Forest Lake plans to incorporate Social Emotional Learning (SEL) into the school day through PBIS practices and Sanford Harmony Kits for teachers to use within their classrooms. Forest Lake Elementary also plans to continue partnerships with the community to build positive relationships.

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

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 the school programs and enhances the educational programs at Forest Lake.

For example, student recognition programs are almost entirely funded through partnering with local business/community groups and fundraising. Throughout the year, business partners are invited to 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 active Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) which brings together parents, teachers, and members of the community to support our students.