Forest City Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Forest City Elementary School

1010 SAND LAKE RD, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0502

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Avellino

Start Date for this Principal: 10/13/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%)
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 was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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 City Elementary School

1010 SAND LAKE RD, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0502

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)
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	76%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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 Forest City Elementary School community is dedicated to preparing all students to become lifelong learners in a safe and caring educational environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To develop a growth mindset, ensure rigorous instruction, and build positive relationships within our school culture that will lead to academic growth in every student.

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
Avellino, Joseph	Principal	Instructional Leader
Baptist, Amanda	Other	Discipline, Title I Compliance, Business Partners, Student Studies Team, Facilities
Tittle, Karen	Instructional Coach	ELA 3-5, MTSS
Rosenberg, Cindy	Instructional Coach	ELA K-2, MTSS
Moore, Ashlay	School Counselor	Student Study, MTSS, Mental Health
Keating, Julie	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 10/13/2021, Joseph Avellino

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.*
1

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

756

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

5

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

3

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	97	142	127	131	136	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	763
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	5	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	4	15	9	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	4	13	7	4	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	13	11	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	4	12	7	5	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	4	9	2	13	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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

Monday 8/15/2022

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	129	134	116	122	124	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	748
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	3	10	5	2	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	2	6	1	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	26	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	1	10	9	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	3	8	8	9	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	129	134	116	122	124	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	748
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	3	10	5	2	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	2	6	1	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	26	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	1	10	9	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	3	8	8	9	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	64%	65%	56%				60%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						54%	61%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						42%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	46%	50%				67%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						59%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						46%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	65%	59%				44%	62%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	67%	-5%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	65%	-3%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	64%	-20%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	71%	-2%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	72%	-7%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	65%	-13%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	62%	-21%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

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	25	33	33	28	40	42	30				
ELL	61	68		52	57		37				
BLK	55	50	50	51	47	44	47				
HSP	65	60	40	61	58	58	53				
MUL	50			46							
WHT	71	56	31	64	55	29	62				
FRL	60	53	33	55	51	41	49				

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	38	53	50	42	50	58	7				
ELL	64	64	55	53	33	45	32				
BLK	50	47		41	40		39				
HSP	62	58	50	53	39	44	38				
MUL	82			55							
WHT	63	60		68	60		59				
FRL	59	59	47	52	49	47	39				

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	27	27	31	45	31	14				
ELL	39	50	48	53	51	50	27				
BLK	57	57	29	64	57	29	34				
HSP	53	54	51	59	55	50	43				
MUL	65	33		65	58						
WHT	65	53	33	74	65	54	48				
FRL	53	49	39	61	55	44	36				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	60
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	48
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	
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	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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?

Forest City has marked trends for several years regarding attendance, the lowest 25% of our student achievement in ELA and Math, and struggles with elevating our scores of 3, 4 and 5 for ELA and Math proficiency.

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

The data components based of progress monitoring and 20-21 state assessments demonstrated a need for improvement in our lowest 25% population for learning in ELA and Math, and regarding fifth grade math proficiency for scores of 3 and above.

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

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Forest City's third grade level math scores increased by 15% proficiency, fifth grade science increased 6% proficiency, and third grade ELA improved by 6% proficiency in ELA.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards based tutoring.

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

Forest City will use its district allocated ESSER funds, provide AM and PM tutorial geared to intervention and enrichment, primary grades provide walk to intervention techniques, science STEM opportunities in a wide range of disciplines, curriculum project, pull-out intervention for lowest 25%, professional development and professional learning input forms for areas which demonstrated need for improvement in 20-21, and a decrease in referrals and suspensions using our PBIS and Behavior Invention Plans in MTSS.

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 will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include focus on instructional strategies Sustainability of improvement efforts Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include support of standards based instruction across all content areas, social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

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.	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Avellino (joseph_avellino@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Lessons aligned to B.E.S.T. benchmarks at the appropriate grade level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

Student Owned Progress Monitoring Plan
Monitor iReady ELA/Math
Tracking: Time, performance, and growth/stretch goals
FAST: track and analyze reading and math skills for students in Kindergarten to Fifth Grades

Person Responsible	Joseph Avellino (joseph_avellino@scps.k12.fl.us)

High level 1 and 2 Monitoring Action Plan
Monitor iReady ELA/Math
Tracking: Time, performance, and growth/stretch goals
FAST Progress Monitoring Three Times

Person Responsible	Joseph Avellino (joseph_avellino@scps.k12.fl.us)

Tutorial, Interventions, Curriculum Project, ESSER Enrichment Academy, RAISE Enrichment and Intervention Support Programs

Person Responsible	Joseph Avellino (joseph_avellino@scps.k12.fl.us)

Family Engagement Title I, PBIS Committee Meetings to improve behavior, focus on safe learning opportunities, and form strong tethers between the school's leadership, teachers, students, and families. All of these will be effective measures resulting in student achievement.

Person Responsible   Joseph Avellino (joseph_avellino@scps.k12.fl.us)

Grade Levels Meet Bi-Weekly To Review Formative Assessments Pertaining To Department Subject Areas

Person Responsible   Joseph Avellino (joseph_avellino@scps.k12.fl.us)

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.

Teachers and administrators use multiple strategies to contact families, including but not limited to, (1) contacting families prior to the start of school to welcome the students to the new school year, (2) inviting families to curriculum nights and open house meetings to meet teachers and school staff and to learn about the curriculum, (3) providing access to school grades, progress monitoring data and other relevant achievement information through the SCPS Skyward Family Access Portal, (4) ensuring students show evidence of "owning their data" and scheduling student led conferences as applicable, (5) inviting families to participate in SAC and PTO Boards, (6) inviting families to attend PTO meetings and participate in school related events, (7) using multiple genres of social networking, as well as sending electronic/paper-based newsletters to families on a regular basis, (8) advertising events on school marquees, (9) and numerous other out-reach strategies developed by school staff.

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

Forest City Elementary stakeholders include parents, students, teachers, community partners, and community members. Parents are the foundational stakeholder for students here at FCE. It is important for that relationship to be established with every parent. With this commitment by teachers, Forest City can support the needs of every student. These needs may vary from educational, behavioral, nourishment, mental health support, clothes, or extracurricular. FCE Staff, not just teachers are responsible and stakeholders for both the students and parents. The staff at Forest City elementary is committed to providing each student with a safe and equitable education. Staff is also responsible for helping the parents to understand the expectations of the students and the teamwork needed to facilitate higher level learning. Parents can reach out to teachers or support staff for any additional support they may need to help their own child. This even includes District Level Support, as Title 1 is a main component and resources are available from the district. Family Engagement is an opportunity where all stakeholders can become involved in the positive culture. Forest City prides itself on including as many stakeholders as possible when creating our various events. Most of the time, these events will bring in various community members to help but has been limited due to recent COVID protocols. Facilities are also rented to a local church, gaining their support for students, and providing resources for learning. Business partners are frequently sponsoring

our luncheons for student achievement, as well as spirit nights. FCE has invited local universities to take part in these events as well. The community is interdependent regarding school, families, and learning here at Forest City Elementary.