

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Forest Grove Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Forest Grove Middle School

3201 S 25TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34981

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fgm/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Keonisha Bobo**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Forest Grove Middle School

3201 S 25TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34981

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fgm/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>75%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>83%</p>

## School Grades History

	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Year</b>				
<b>Grade</b>		B	B	C

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

## 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 Forest Grove Middle School is to provide a dynamic, enriching environment where students are empowered, with the help of family and the community, to become compassionate life-long learners.

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

Our vision is to empower students with skills for the 21st century through rigorous academic curriculum, while promoting a culture of cooperation and active participation, where all are Respected and achievement is Expected.

### 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
Jamison, Arthur	Principal	The Principal serves as an instructional leader school-wide, supervising operations and personnel at school base. A concentrated focus this year on Science, Social Studies and Electives as well as overseeing discipline. Oversee compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all school based activities.
Reilly, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional programs and school based level operations. A concentrated focus will be on Math, English and ESE. The AP also has oversight of the facility, technology and extra-curricular events to ensure all paperwork is completed thoroughly. The AP will serve on various committees established by the school/school district.
Barriner, Katina	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach (Barriner) works with the English department to create high-quality lesson plans and then follow-up with classroom support and feedback with the teachers. She will also work closely with new teachers to ensure each understands the depth of the standards that must be taught. She will share content knowledge and model effective instructional practices. Furthermore, Barriner will assist in spearheading instructional professional development trainings based on improving areas of concern within classroom instruction.
Rogers, April	Reading Coach	The Reading coach (Rogers) work with the Reading and Social Studies departments to create high-quality lesson plans and then follow-up with classroom support and feedback with the teachers. She will also work closely with new teachers to ensure each understands the depth of the standards that must be taught. She will share content knowledge and model effective instructional practices. Furthermore, Rogers will be call upon to aid in spearheading instructional professional development trainings based on improving areas of concern within classroom instruction.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Thursday 8/1/2019, Keonisha Bobo

**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.*

6

**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.*

20



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

44

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

897

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

10

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

10

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	283	285	0	0	0	0	877
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	118	126	0	0	0	0	381
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	33	29	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	84	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	16	53	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	90	77	0	0	0	0	266
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	102	94	0	0	0	0	325
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	27	3	0	0	0	0	90

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	129	138	0	0	0	0	425

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	314	305	290	0	0	0	0	909
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	52	44	33	0	0	0	0	129
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	88	81	0	0	0	0	253
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	125	91	0	0	0	0	323

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	314	305	290	0	0	0	0	909
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	52	44	33	0	0	0	0	129
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	88	81	0	0	0	0	253
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	125	91	0	0	0	0	323

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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				47%	44%	54%	44%	43%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	51%	54%	52%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	45%	47%	44%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				41%	45%	58%	44%	46%	58%
Math Learning Gains				50%	51%	57%	55%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	51%	51%	56%	50%	51%
Science Achievement				42%	41%	51%	37%	42%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				65%	64%	72%	61%	70%	72%

**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
06	2021					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	23%	47%	-24%	55%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
07	2021					
	2019	41%	50%	-9%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
08	2021					
	2019	20%	34%	-14%	46%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2021					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	48%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	61%	67%	-6%	71%	-10%

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	79%	51%	28%	61%	18%

<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	88%	55%	33%	57%	31%

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for 6-8 was iReady Diagnostics. Science and Civics progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	44	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	42	43
	Students With Disabilities	22	19	23
	English Language Learners	25	11	19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	58	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	55	64
	Students With Disabilities	24	21	46
	English Language Learners	21	28	46

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	36	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	32	40
	Students With Disabilities	12	16	13
	English Language Learners	6	9	16
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	36	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	36	42
	Students With Disabilities	11	19	22
	English Language Learners	21	20	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	26	23	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	21	35
	Students With Disabilities	16	18	33
	English Language Learners	12	12	20

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	51	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	48	42
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	6
	English Language Learners	16	27	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33	22	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	22	21
	Students With Disabilities	5	0	8
	English Language Learners	19	11	19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	45	54	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	54	39
	Students With Disabilities	32	42	14
	English Language Learners	35	55	22

**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	19	31	20	20	44	45	9	29			
ELL	28	41	37	28	45	52	15	51	67		
ASN	70	60		60	50						
BLK	26	38	30	18	33	42	20	39	43		
HSP	46	46	36	39	48	53	34	54	76		
MUL	67	56		39	44						
WHT	62	53	33	57	46	55	66	60	88		
FRL	39	43	33	31	42	48	32	46	74		
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	25	42	34	21	57	52	24	44			
ELL	20	52	55	19	45	64	14	48			

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
ASN	90	80		90	80						
BLK	34	48	46	27	48	55	33	56	77		
HSP	47	60	57	39	44	58	34	65	76		
MUL	45	62		43	64			40			
WHT	69	67	54	70	60	63	71	87	90		
FRL	41	56	50	33	45	56	33	57	75		
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	17	39	33	17	45	41	8	29			
ELL	13	40	40	18	50	56	9	28			
BLK	32	48	50	34	55	57	22	51	74		
HSP	43	48	38	43	58	58	40	61	84		
MUL	30	50		29	43						
WHT	67	66	50	64	51	50	59	75	81		
FRL	38	49	45	39	56	55	32	59	83		

**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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	40



English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
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	47
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	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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?

All scores across grade levels and sub groups declined in our progress monitoring data, most notably English Learning Gains declined in our projected data more than was expected. Students lower scores are partially due to lack of reading comprehension and fluency.

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

The data component that surprisingly showed the greatest decline from the prior assessment year was English lowest 25%. Students unable to read and comprehend what they read was a major barrier.

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

We believe two contributing factors led to the decline: 1) Changes in the teaching personnel that directly affected the students. 2) Students struggle with reading which impacts their comprehension and fluency.

School based interventionist to focus on small groups to aid in improving students comprehension and fluency.

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

No data component show improvement, but math did not decline as much as expected.

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

There were two contributing factors that aided in this change, 1) Their were no changes in the math department, unlike previous years. This helped with teacher/student continuity. 2) We double-blocked as many math sections that we could, thus giving students more class time to be able to work on the foundational skills.

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

Increase of student reading across all content areas to build on vocabulary and fluency. Additionally, an increase of student writing across all content areas to help build on students' comprehension on what was read and being able to explain in document form.

**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.**

District provided assistance will be requested and welcomed. The expectation is that these individuals will assist with collaborative planning and our PD efforts.

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

Small group Instruction  
 On-going collaborative planning and PD efforts with the district's assistance  
 After-school tutoring

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	According to our data progress monitoring data, ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains declined more that expected. By focusing on this area, it not only supports our ELA efforts but also provides a stronger foundation that is necessary for student success in other content areas such as Math, Science and Civics. Our target sub-group within the lowest 25%, will be the SWD and ELL students.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our goal for ELA is to repeat our scores from 2018-2019, (47% Proficiency, 58% Learning Gains, 52% Lowest 25% Learning Gains) by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Monitoring will be conducted through the review of assessment data (unit assessments, I-Ready, & Reading Plus) after every assessment to ensure our students are on track.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Andrea Reilly (andrea.reilly@stlucieschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	A 90-minute block for as many Level 1s and 2s in ELA to be able to cover the standards more in-depth.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students who struggle with reading need additional support with the content. During the 90-minute block, students will be given more individualized attention to address deficiencies through focus one-on-one instruction.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Reading Plus for all level 1 and 2 students.
2. Small group pullout (Reading Interventionist) one-on-one instruction for as many level 1's as possible.
3. Reading Interventionist to support through planning and coaching.
4. Implementation of The 8 Reading Strategies. These strategies are used in the ELA classes with the goal of content area teachers for Science and Social Studies to use and reinforce in their classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Andrea Reilly (andrea.reilly@stlucieschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to our progress monitoring data, Math Proficiency and Learning Gains saw a decline. Our target sub-group within the lowest 25%, will be the SWD and ELL students.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our goal for Math is to repeat our scores from 2018-2019, (41% Proficiency, 50% Learning Gains, 58% Lowest 25% Learning Gains) by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

**Monitoring:** Through our CLP's teachers will review and discuss unit assessment and I-Ready data. Admin will attend meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Andrea Reilly (andrea.reilly@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** By double-blocking as many math classes that we can, more time will be provided for teachers and students to work with the skills/concepts in math, the more they will find success. We will also incorporate I-Ready Math (with laptops in the classes) to help the students improve on concepts that they are low in. Additionally, the Math coach will support the teachers through small group pullout and planning and coaching.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Schedule as many Level 1's and 2's into 90 minutes of math instruction during the day.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Schedule as many (Math) Level 1 and 2 students into a 90-minute block to be able to spend more time covering the standards.
2. I-Ready Math Instruction through rotations.
3. Math Coach to support through planning, coaching and small group pullout.

**Person Responsible:** Andrea Reilly (andrea.reilly@stlucieschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Monitoring:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** At FGMS our English Language Learners are not progressing at the same rate as non-disabled students as identified from 2018-2019 FSA scores, unit assessments, I-Ready diagnostics, Reading Plus and FSAA results.

**Measurable Outcome:** At FGMS English Language Learners will make at least 5% academic growth as evidence on the I-Ready Diagnostic, FSA and FSAA assessments.

**Monitoring:** Within their CLP meetings, the teachers will discuss the I-Ready and Reading Plus and unit assessment data. Administration and English department chair will attend these meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Katina Barriner (katina.barriner@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our targeted English Language Learners will be provided small group remediation focusing on skills/standards not mastered as noted by progress monitoring. These groups will be fluid based on the data and student need.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Pulling small groups and utilizing high-yield effect strategies such as the jigsaw method (1.20 effect size) for remediation with a focus on skills/standards not mastered.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The teachers and English coach will review the unit assessment and I-Ready data results after each administration. From this, student support will be determined, provided and tracked.

Teachers will reteach/remediate skill/standard to check for understanding and determine skill mastery.

**Person Responsible** Katina Barriner (katina.barriner@stlucieschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

**Using the Safe School data Forest Grove ranks in the "Moderate - 269/553" range compared to other schools across the state in the same category. Areas of concern are violent incidents (fights), leading to higher than usual suspensions. These two categories will be monitored through our monthly PBIS and weekly Leadership Team meetings. Additionally, incentives have been established to reward the school for improved behavior.**

**In an effort to strengthen our relationships within the community, we are continuing to increase our participation in events such as SAC and the MOA-Prep parent group to ensure our goals are being communicated out into the community.**

**The master schedule demonstrates our commitment to research-based decisions. We have increased the class time (to 90 minutes) in the majority of the Math and ELA classes for our low level students to cover the standards more in depth.**

**Finally, In an effort to increase our attendance percentage rate, we will continue our Attendance Committee weekly meetings. In these meetings strategies are discussed and put into implementation, i.e.: home phone calls, PBIS, mentoring programs with outside organizations, and social worker assistance. This will be essential as many of our students will start the school year taking online classes.**

#### **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.**

At Forest Grove we are building a positive school culture by listening to the various stakeholder groups (teachers, staff, students, and their families) to employ processes and procedures geared towards impacting to school culture positively.

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

At FGMS we are continuing to build on our upward climb in promoting a positive culture and environment. Faculty - We have continued seek and hire a diverse group of teachers that are eager to work with the students of the community that we service. Additionally, we have retained 80% of our best and brightest teachers over the past year.

Students - Our focus is on a Single School Culture - Where all are Respected and academic achievement is Expected. We encourage our students to reach an adult if they have or see an issue. Additionally, our students receive a minimum of 30 minutes in SEL Circles, ranging from different topics recommended by the SEL department at the district level.

Parents - Parents provide input to the leadership team, as the school has an open door policy. Community members are apart of school committees and provide mentorship to our students. Furthermore, parents have an opportunity to provide input in our SAC, MOA-Prep and Title I monthly meeting events.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
2	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
3	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
4	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>