# Forest Ridge Elementary School

**2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Forest Ridge Elementary School

### 2927 N FOREST RIDGE BLVD, Hernando, FL 34442

### https://fre.citrusschools.org/

## Demographics

## Principal: Michelle Mchugh

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (61%)<br><br>2017-18: C (51%)<br><br>2016-17: B (58%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **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 Citrus 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

# Forest Ridge Elementary School

## 2927 N FOREST RIDGE BLVD, Hernando, FL 34442

## https://fre.citrusschools.org/

## 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 | 78% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 35% |

## 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 Citrus 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 Forest Ridge Elementary is to create a community of life-long learners
who will engage in meaningful activities to enhance academic growth, celebrate diversity and experience
success.

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

We will maintain each child's right to learn through appropriate learning experiences, sound discipline
policies and self-respect for others. We pledge to communicate to parents and involve them in this
process.

### 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 |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| McHugh, Michelle | Principal | Lead Staff, students and families to high levels of academic achievement |
| Ear, Sean | Assistant Principal | Supports the Principal in leading the school community to high levels of academic Success |
| Bone, Heather | Instructional Coach | Assisting teachers in all academic areas, coaching/modeling instructional methods and strategies, analyzing student achievement for the purpose of raising student achievement |
| Rossi, Shannon | Staffing Specialist | ESE specialist, assist in the identification and support of students with special needs. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Sunday 7/1/2018, Michelle Mchugh

**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.*
1

**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.*
7

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

37

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

726

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

**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 | 107 | 98 | 110 | 114 | 95 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 628 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 17 | 25 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4 | 17 | 28 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |

**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 | 3 | 10 | 12 | 15 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |

**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 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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**

Wednesday 8/25/2021

**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 | 98 | 125 | 119 | 104 | 108 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 669 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

**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 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 98 | 125 | 119 | 104 | 108 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 669 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

**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 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 67% | 59% | 57% | 63% | 59% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 61% | 56% | 58% | 49% | 50% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54% | 48% | 53% | 36% | 41% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 70% | 60% | 63% | 65% | 66% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 69% | 54% | 62% | 49% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52% | 39% | 51% | 33% | 39% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 53% | 60% | 53% | 65% | 61% | 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 | 72% | 61% | 11% | 58% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 55% | 14% | 58% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -72% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 58% | -8% | 56% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 58% | 11% | 62% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 59% | 20% | 64% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 60% | -7% | 60% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -79% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 58% | -6% | 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.**

iReady Diagnostic administered in the Fall, Winter, Spring

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13 | 17 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 | 12 | 25 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 14 | 10 | 34 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 7 | 28 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 15 | 32 | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3 | 13 | 25 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 7 | 26 | 36 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 2 | 12 | 20 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33 | 39 | 51 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17 | 18 | 27 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 9 | 16 | 45 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3 | 6 | 23 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Number/% Proficiency** | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **English Language Arts** | All Students | 22 | 30 | 34 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11 | 15 | 17 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | **Number/% Proficiency** | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **Mathematics** | All Students | 6 | 15 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3 | 8 | 12 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 1` |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Number/% Proficiency** | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **English Language Arts** | All Students | 16 | 19 | 31 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10 | 9 | 15 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| | **Number/% Proficiency** | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **Mathematics** | All Students | 8 | 21 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6 | 13 | 25 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | **Number/% Proficiency** | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **Science** | All Students | 34 | 53 | 57 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 38 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | English Language Learners | 2 | 2 | 3 |

## 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 | 22 | 8 | | 18 | 15 | | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 100 | | | 91 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 43 | | 46 | 43 | | 41 | | | | |
| MUL | 56 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 43 | 35 | 59 | 45 | 36 | 54 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 39 | 30 | 47 | 38 | 30 | 43 | | | | |

| 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 | 31 | 36 | 37 | 34 | 55 | 45 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | 73 | | 92 | 82 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 36 | | 41 | 64 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 63 | | 65 | 65 | | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | 79 | | 70 | 71 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 59 | 50 | 72 | 68 | 45 | 54 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 57 | 50 | 67 | 66 | 50 | 51 | | | | |

| 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 | 38 | 27 | 17 | 38 | 40 | 26 | 50 | | | | |
| ASN | 100 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 50 | | 41 | 50 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 41 | 20 | 59 | 41 | | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 75 | | | 53 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 48 | 42 | 67 | 50 | 33 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 45 | 34 | 61 | 48 | 35 | 60 | | | | |

## 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 | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 310 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 14 |
| 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 | 33 |
| 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 | 96 |
| 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 | 0 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 53 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?

IReady data in 5th grade showed low performance and low growth. In grades 1,2,4 and 5 math low performance and low growth. Overall in grades 3-5 our students scoring a level 3 or higher in FSA math showed a decline from 2019 from 70% to 54% there was also a decline from 67% to 59% in FSA ELA. There was a slight decline in Science from 53% to 49% in comparison to the state at 47% the district average of 45%. Key Idea and Details we were above the district average however it is our lowest in grades 3-5. Integration of knowledge we were above the district but we were low across the grade level in 3rd. In 4th grade it was our lowest in the grade level and below the district average. 4th grade math we were below the district overall.

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

Our 3-5 grade overall math scores showed a decline from 70% to 54% and shows the greatest need for improvement.

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

The inconsistent instruction students received while not in attendance in school for a variety of reasons. Data days to analyze standards mastery assessment, iReady diagnostic, MAFs, grade level/ classroom assessments.

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

iReady data showed the 1-3 ELA data showed the most improvement as 1-3 math. Grades 2, 4 and 5th all showed low performance and high growth

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

Year 2 of implementation and teachers doing it with fidelity and using the data formatively

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

PLC's, data days, PD's for BEST standards and our new reading curriculum Wonders.

**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.**

Book Study of the Art & Science of Teaching, Ruby Payne Emotional Poverty in all Demographic, Data Days, Team planning, Lexia Core training

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

Lexia for our students needing interventions, PD for our ESE teachers to deliver SDI

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Increase learning gains for SWD students. The 2019 data indicated that we were below the 40% on the federal percent of points index with a score of 38%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Forest Ridge will increase to earn 43% of the points on the federal percent of points index |
| **Monitoring:** | Data review of SWD group. Teachers will adjust instruction based on the student needs as indicated by the data. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Heather Bone (boneh@citrusschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Providing Professional development on The Science Art of Teaching and delivery of SDI |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | To support the teachers in delivery instruction to expand the students capacity for learning based on specific science of teaching. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly grade level meetings
2. PD high yield strategies for SWD to enhance specially designed instruction
3. iReady Data chats and PD
4. Learning targets for every lesson

**Person Responsible**    Heather Bone (boneh@citrusschools.org)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our 3-5 grade overall math scores showed a decline from 70% to 54% and shows the greatest need for improvement. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Student scoring a 3 or above in FSA math will be 60% |
| **Monitoring:** | - weekly grade level meetings<br>-data review days<br>- teachers will adjust their instruction based on the student needs as indicated by the data |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citrusschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | - Data Review to modify and adjust instruction<br>- Providing Professional development on The Science Art of Teaching |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | To support the teachers in delivery instruction to expand the students capacity for learning based on specific science of teaching. Our 3-5 grade overall math scores showed a decline from 70% to 54% |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Learning targets for every lesson
Weekly Grade level meetings
PD The New Art and Science of Teaching

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citrusschools.org) |
|---|---|

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | In grades 3-5 our students scoring a level 3 or higher showed a decline from 2019 from 67% to 59% in FSA ELA. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Student scoring a 3 or above in FSA math will be 60% |
| **Monitoring:** | Weekly grade level meetings<br>PD The New Art and Science of Teaching<br>Learning Targets posted and implicitly used throughout the lessons<br>data review to analyze data and the teacher will make adjustments in instruction |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citrusschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Weekly grade level meetings<br>PD The New Art and Science of Teaching<br>Learning Targets posted and implicitly used throughout the lessons<br>data review |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | To support the teachers in delivery instruction to expand the students capacity for learning based on specific science of teaching. In grades 3-5 our students scoring a level 3 or higher showed a decline from 2019 from 67% to 59% in FSA ELA |

| Action Steps to Implement |
|---|

Weekly grade level meetings
PD The New Art and Science of Teaching
Learning Targets posted and implicitly used throughout the lessons
data review

| **Person Responsible** | Heather Bone (boneh@citrusschools.org) |
|---|---|

| #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Increase student performance in Science |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Students scoring a 3 or above will be 60% |
| **Monitoring:** | Study Island data review |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Michelle McHugh (mchughm@citrusschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Weekly data review with 4/5 teachers. Teachers will adjust their instruction based on the student needs as indicated by the data |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Students scoring a 3 or above was 49% it declined from previous year of 53% |

### Action Steps to Implement

learning target for every lesson
Departmentalized team in 5th grade
Grade level team meeting to review and analyze the data
Study Island used daily

| **Person Responsible** | Heather Bone (boneh@citrusschools.org) |
|---|---|

### 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 looking at the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, comparing the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state a primary area of concern is the school's violent incident rate per 100 students FRE was at .41 where the statewide average is 0-37.58. FRE will monitor this data during the upcoming school year. FRE is a PBS school which helps us establish positive social culture and behavior. We analyze the discipline data through our PBS committee and then share out to staff monthly.**

## 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 Ridge Elementary seeks PTA group members through newsletters, phone calls and monthly meetings. Ranking members such as president are nominated by others involved participants and then voted on. Forest Ridge Elementary uses a variety of communication methods to keep parents informed and involved in making decisions to assist our parent in becoming partners in their child's education. Parents are in a variety of ways encourage to participate in surveys, and school events such as Literacy Night, PTA, SAC, volunteering, mentoring, family nights, Fitness Owls and parent conferences. At FRE we seek parental input on ways to improve usage of Title 1. To increase participation and support from our parents we encoutage all staff members to utilize classroom newsletters, fliers, school messenger, the school website, social media, class dojo, remind and electronically to meetings and parent nights.

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

Stakeholder groups 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.