Forest Glen Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Forest Glen Middle School

6501 TURTLE RUN BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33067

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Gurreonero

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2021-22 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%)
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	ATSI
* 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 Broward 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 Glen Middle School

6501 TURTLE RUN BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33067

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Cultivating and inspiring lifelong learners whose love for applying their knowledge will bring them success in today and tomorrow's world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create and maintain a safe learning community of students and adults who embrace new opportunities to learn and grow together through engaging experiences while demonstrating respect, responsibility, and accountability to themselves and each other.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gurreonero, Melissa	Principal	The School Principal shall effectively lead and manage instructional leadership, operational leadership, and professional and ethical leadership.
Clock, Christine	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community.
Barnett, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Melissa Gurreonero

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,107

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	384	390	431	0	0	0	0	1205
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	102	114	0	0	0	0	310
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	76	52	0	0	0	0	190
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	3	2	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	6	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	115	127	0	0	0	0	312
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	105	133	0	0	0	0	344
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	47	41	0	0	0	0	148

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	106	132	128	0	0	0	0	366

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	379	413	466	0	0	0	0	1258
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	50	63	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	12	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	40	24	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	29	19	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	73	89	0	0	0	0	224
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	65	86	0	0	0	0	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	170	175	0	0	0	0	478
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	99	121	136	0	0	0	0	356

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	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	16

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	379	413	466	0	0	0	0	1258
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	50	63	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	12	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	40	24	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	29	19	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	73	89	0	0	0	0	224
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	65	86	0	0	0	0	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	170	175	0	0	0	0	478
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	99	121	136	0	0	0	0	356

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	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	16

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	54%	50%				61%	57%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						60%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						47%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	52%	41%	36%				62%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%						55%	58%	57%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						39%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	52%	53%				51%	49%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	63%	58%				67%	71%	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	2022					
	2019	62%	57%	5%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	52%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2022					
	2019	65%	59%	6%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	59%	58%	1%	55%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	46%	53%	-7%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
08	2022					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	46%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	29%	43%	-14%	48%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2022						
2019	96%	67%	29%	67%	29%	

CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2022						
2019	61%	71%	-10%	71%	-10%	

HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2022						
2019						

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2022						
2019	95%	61%	34%	61%	34%	

GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2022						
2019	99%	56%	43%	57%	42%	

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	34	31	26	43	33	14	36			
ELL	23	40	45	31	44	44	21	36	52		
ASN	76	79		78	86		88		91		
BLK	36	41	37	43	55	55	40	64	67		
HSP	46	49	40	48	55	43	46	65	71		
MUL	61	53		59	59		46	92	77		
WHT	67	51	33	71	68	52	71	79	86		

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
FRL	39	43	38	44	55	52	44	62	69		

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	13	35	37	18	25	26	7	21	33		
ELL	33	41	40	35	22	20	22	35	48		
ASN	75	63		75	42		78	79	82		
BLK	41	38	35	35	20	19	35	45	55		
HSP	48	44	40	47	24	23	50	44	59		
MUL	58	42		55	32		50	54	69		
WHT	63	55	24	64	37	33	64	59	74		
FRL	43	42	36	40	22	21	39	43	54		

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	21	38	32	26	34	27	13	48	29		
ELL	41	56	50	44	45	36	33	41	47		
ASN	89	72		90	70		83	95	87		
BLK	54	52	37	50	45	33	37	61	74		
HSP	56	61	58	61	53	35	44	63	67		
MUL	56	49	27	51	49			70			
WHT	75	69	64	77	69	58	70	79	85		
FRL	54	56	43	53	47	34	39	59	68		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	526
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

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%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Test scores have shown growth and partial recovery to pre-pandemic levels across grade levels. Math has shown the most recovery, improving from 47 to 52 percent overall, 27 to 59 percent in the area of learning gains, and 23 to 50 percent learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile. Social studies also demonstrated recovery and showed growth from 49 to 68 percent and science improved by 1-point. ELA demonstrated mixed results with overall proficiency decreasing by 2 points, but increasing 2 points in learning gains from 45 to 47 percent and 35 to 39 percent. Acceleration continues to be the strongest area of data. Both ELL and SWD improved in the area of learning gains for math by 18 and 22 points overall and 24 and 7 for the lowest 25th percentile. Overall proficiency in math for SWD improved by 8 points but decreased by 4 points for ELL. In the area of ELA proficiency for SWD increased by 4 percentage points, but decreased by 10 points for ELL students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA is the area in the greatest need of improvement. While some growth was shown in this area it has not recovered to pre-pandemic levels and did not improve as much as the area of math. Test scores have shown growth and partial recovery to pre-pandemic levels across grade levels. 83% of SWD are not proficient in ELA and 74% are not proficient in Math. ELL students 77% are not proficient in ELA and 69% are not proficient in Math.

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 contributing factors that led to this need for improvement are multifaceted. First, the pandemic interrupted standard instructional methods for this cohort of students. While some students were able to adapt to virtual learning, others struggled with both attendance and learning while at home. Second, the county adopted a new ELA curriculum, and students and teachers had to adjust to the new instructional materials while simultaneously attempting to close the learning gap perpetuated by the pandemic. This year the ELA and Reading departments are functioning in a more integrated way and the teachers are more familiar with the complementation of the curriculum which is fully aligned to the BEST standards. Additionally, the ESSER coach is working to pull out students who are close to proficiency to work with

them on differentiating instruction. This along with the ESE Department's Support Facilitators working with SWD students will work towards improvement in ELA. ELL students will have push-in support in social studies to assist with increasing literacy skills with informational text.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math data showed the greatest improvements across both progress monitoring and state assessment data, improving from 47% to 52% proficiency. Learning gains improved from 27% to 59%.

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

The factors contributing to this improvement in math were extended learning opportunities provided by ESSER coaches, who pulled students and worked with them based on formative progress monitoring data to remediate as indicated on basic skills. Teachers also worked with individual students and differentiated instruction as appropriate to meet the needs of the students. I-ready training and implementation of remediation during and after school helped students reach proficiency and make learning gains.

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

ESSER positions are being implemented to pull targeted SWD, ELL, and level 2 students in both reading and math. Additionally, teachers will be implementing the READ 180 and System 44 curriculum in reading providing tiered instruction and targeted remediation. In math, enVision math is being implemented including the use of individualized pathways to bridge the gap between underlying skills and grade level skills. The school is also implementing common planning by content area, allowing for both horizontal and vertical instructional planning. Teachers work on a weekly basis to collect and analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction based on student needs to move towards proficiency on state assessments.

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 development for teachers will include schoolwide literacy strategies tailored to each department. The Literacy coach is working closely with teachers to infuse these strategies into their lesson plans. During common planning, the teachers are integrating these literacy strategies into instructional plans. The math department received textbook implementation professional development to increase teacher confidence in the use of the new curriculum and to learn how to manage and assign personalized learning for students. The ELA department is receiving additional PD in notice and note and Socratic seminars.

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

The District has adopted online programs for Reading and Math that is creates learning pathways for each student based on their strengths and weaknesses.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The data regarding SWD in both ELA and Math shows that these students' learning must be an instructional priority for Forest Glen. Only 17% SWD are proficient in ELA and 26% in Math. This is far below the overall data by both school and grade level.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	30% of SWD will become proficient in ELA and 35% will become proficient in Math as demonstrated on the FSA in May of 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through Common Formative Assessments, and District and State Mid Year and Summative assessments in ELA, Reading, and Math. Administrators and teachers will analyze emerging data and make instructional adjustments as the year progresses.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Clock (christine.clock@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will work in PLCs to analyze data and plan standards-based lessons to provide targeted instruction for SWD students. Teachers will collaborate with Support Facilitators for assistance and for meeting the needs of students through instructional adjustments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Collaboration in PLCs has been proven to support teachers in creating engaging lessons to support student success.

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

Weekly implementation of PLCs and Common planning

Person Responsible	Tiffany Barnett (tiffany.barnett@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The data regarding ELL in both ELA and Math shows that these students' learning must be an instructional priority for Forest Glen. Only 23% of ELL are proficient in ELA and 31% in Math. This is far below the overall data by both school and grade level.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	30% of ELL will become proficient in ELA and 36% will become proficient in Math as demonstrated on the FSA in May of 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through Common Formative Assessments, and District and State Mid Year and Summative assessments in ELA, Reading, and Math. Administrators and teachers will analyze emerging data and make instructional adjustments as the year progresses. Additionally, ACCESS data will be analyzed and ELL Support will be infused into content classes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Barnett (tiffany.barnett@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will work in PLCs to analyze data and plan standards-based lessons to provide targeted instruction for ELL students through the implementation of ESOL strategies in lessons. Teachers will collaborate with ELL support facilitators for assistance and for meeting the needs of students through instructional adjustments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Collaboration in PLCs has been proven to support teachers in creating engaging lessons to support student success.

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

Professional development on ELL strategies for teachers

Person Responsible	Tiffany Barnett (tiffany.barnett@browardschools.com)

Weekly implementation of PLCs and Common planning

Person Responsible	Tiffany Barnett (tiffany.barnett@browardschools.com)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Forest Glen builds and maintains a positive school culture through a variety of means, including a Positive Behavior Plan which includes student incentives, morning announcements, staff incentives, Professional Development and Learning Communities, and Social Emotional Learning plans. Students have daily reinforcement of our Glen House Rules "Be Responsible, Be Respectful, and Be Safe." Students also have the opportunity to earn tickets and to earn the opportunity to attend quarterly incentives based on a combination of learning and positive behavior. Student achievement and growth is celebrated through awards ceremonies and honor roll and the use of our incentive ticket cart. Staff growth and feedback are obtained during weekly PLC and Professional Development is planned to support teachers and provide them with resources as needed. Teachers have developed collaborative relationships and work together during common planning to analyze student data and plan engaging standards-based lessons. This is having a positive influence on the school culture as it allows students to have exposure to rigorous lessons and enhances the development of 21st-century skills with students. Students are engaged in SEL activities throughout the week in different content areas and this helps to reinforce the development of positive social skills and provides support for students to practice a positive mindset when dealing with life situations that may arise. Additionally, students have access to participate in a wide variety of clubs, extracurricular activities, and sports. Students also serve as role models to their peers through our Peer Counseling Program. The school also obtains feedback from all stakeholder groups and uses this data to continuously improve the school culture and environment.

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

All stakeholders are encouraged to become involved and provide feedback as a way of promoting a positive school culture and environment. All members of the faculty work together to reinforce positive behavior and learning through the implementation of the PBIS plan. Additionally, the school works with parents and the PTO to provide incentives for staff and students. The school works with the feeder elementary and high schools to build partnerships within the feeder pattern to create smooth transitions between school levels and develop a positive culture where parents can learn about programming and school culture before making decisions about school choice/enrollment. Area businesses also partner with the school to provide positive incentives to the school staff and students. The Community Before and After Care program provides safe and positive options for members of the community who opt to have students participate.