# Forsyth Woods Elementary



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Forsyth Woods Elementary

6651 CURTIS ST, Orlando, FL 32807

https://forsythwoodses.ocps.net/

## Demographics

## Principal: Kelly Maldonado

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **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>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (55%)<br><br>2017-18: B (56%)<br><br>2016-17: 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** | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

## 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

## Forsyth Woods Elementary

### 6651 CURTIS ST, Orlando, FL 32807

### https://forsythwoodses.ocps.net/

## 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 | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 83% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | | B | B | B |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

## 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.**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways
that lead our students to success

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

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

### 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 |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Maldonado, Kelly | Principal | The job duties and responsibilities of the principal are to ensure all areas of the school improvement plan are implemented with fidelity. In addition, the principal is responsible for ensuring the budget and funding resources are appropriately allocated to support the areas of focus and action plan items. |
| Clemente, Luriela | Assistant Principal | The job duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal include supporting the principal to ensure that all areas of the School Improvement Plan are implemented on a timely manner. In addition, the assistant principal ensures that the right progress monitoring tools are in place and functioning so teachers have the information needed to drive instruction and impact student achievement. |
| Zagarella, Jennifer | Curriculum Resource Teacher | The job duties and responsibilities for Mrs. Zagarella include the Curriculum Resource Teacher, Testing Coordinator and Math Coach to support teachers and classroom instruction. |
| Hartley, Kimberly | Instructional Coach | The job duties and responsibilities of Mrs. Hartley is to serve the teachers as an Instructional Coach. Mrs. Hartley supports the action plan of the SIP while supporting classroom teachers with new initiatives and strategies to improve student achievement. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Sunday 6/24/2018, Kelly Maldonado

**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.*

3

**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.*

4

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

46

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

430

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

1

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

7

**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 | 27 | 78 | 65 | 92 | 75 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 14 | 32 | 18 | 28 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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**

Friday 7/16/2021

## 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 | 43 | 57 | 76 | 82 | 98 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 438 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 6 | 23 | 11 | 24 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

**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 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 43 | 57 | 76 | 82 | 98 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 438 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 6 | 23 | 11 | 24 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

**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 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | | | | 48% | 57% | 57% | 52% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 58% | 58% | 60% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59% | 52% | 53% | 57% | 48% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 53% | 63% | 63% | 66% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 52% | 61% | 62% | 51% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52% | 48% | 51% | 49% | 46% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 60% | 56% | 53% | 54% | 55% | 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 | 36% | 55% | -19% | 58% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 57% | -11% | 58% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 54% | -4% | 56% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -46% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 62% | -21% | 62% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 63% | -12% | 64% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 57% | -7% | 60% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 54% | 0% | 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.**

Forsyth Woods Elementary uses iReady Reading and Math Diagnostics to progress monitor the students. In 5th Grade Science, we use the PMA (Progress Monitoring Assessment) provided by Orange County Public Schools (OCPS) to track their progress.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 73/19% | 73/32% | 73/44% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 73/19% | 73/32% | 73/44% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/0% | 5/20% | 5/40% |
| | English Language Learners | 19/0% | 19/11% | 19/0% |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 73/19% | 73/29% | 73/41% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 73/19% | 73/29% | 73/41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/0% | 5/0% | 5/80% |
| | English Language Learners | 19/2% | 19/16% | 19/11% |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 94/14% | 94/29% | 94/39% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 94/14% | 94/29% | 94/39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11/0% | 11/27% | 11/27% |
| | English Language Learners | 35/3% | 35/14% | 35/20% |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 94/6% | 94/16% | 94/36% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 94/6% | 94/16% | 94/36% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11/0% | 11/0% | 11/18% |
| | English Language Learners | 35/6% | 35/6% | 35/17% |

| Grade 3 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 99/28% | 99/43% | 99/53% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 99/28% | 99/43% | 99/53% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15/13% | 15/27% | 15/47% |
| | English Language Learners | 34/24% | 34/44% | 34/53% |
| **Mathematics** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 99/3% | 99/19% | 99/34% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 99/3% | 99/19% | 99/34% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15/0% | 15/6% | 15/38% |
| | English Language Learners | 34/3% | 34/21% | 34/32% |

| Grade 4 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 101/26% | 101/31% | 101/41% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 101/26% | 101/31% | 101/41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11/9% | 11/9% | 11/27% |
| | English Language Learners | 32/9% | 32/9% | 32/13% |
| **Mathematics** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 101/11% | 101/26% | 101/38% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 101/11% | 101/26% | 101/36% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11/0% | 11/0% | 11/18% |
| | English Language Learners | 32/3% | 32/13% | 32/25% |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 100/13% | 100/21% | 100/23% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 100/13% | 100/21% | 100/23% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13/0% | 13/8% | 13/23% |
| | English Language Learners | 20/0% | 20/15% | 20/5% |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 100/12% | 100/23% | 100/28% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 100/12% | 100/23% | 100/28% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13/0% | 13/8% | 13/8% |
| | English Language Learners | 20/5% | 20/15% | 20/20% |
| **Science** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 92/66% | 97/43% | 100/40% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 92/66% | 97/43% | 100/40% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13/1% | 13/1% | 13/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 20/1% | 20/1% | 20/2% |

## 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 | 11 | 33 | | 12 | 14 | 10 | | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 27 | 43 | 24 | 29 | 9 | 11 | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | | | 31 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 29 | 35 | 32 | 23 | 13 | 25 | | | | |
| WHT | 21 | | | 13 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 34 | 41 | 29 | 21 | 12 | 18 | | | | |
| 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 | 30 | 57 | 57 | 32 | 32 | 54 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 60 | 60 | 48 | 49 | 59 | 58 | | | | |
| ASN | 64 | | | 73 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 61 | | 52 | 63 | | 40 | | | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 47 | 59 | 61 | 53 | 50 | 51 | 60 | | | | |
| WHT | 44 | 50 | | 44 | 30 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 57 | 58 | 49 | 48 | 49 | 52 | | | | |
| **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 | 26 | 56 | 47 | 41 | 42 | 31 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 60 | 59 | 54 | 44 | 54 | 21 | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 64 | | 74 | 71 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 58 | 59 | 63 | 47 | 46 | 53 | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 59 | 56 | 65 | 50 | 48 | 52 | | | | |

## 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 | 31 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 46 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 245 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 18 |
| 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 | 27 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 33 |
| 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 | 30 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

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

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

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 25 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 29 |
| 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?

An overall trend across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas show that our ELL student proficiency is low (0% in reading and 11% in math) in 1st grade. It climbs to 53% in 3rd Grade Reading and 32% in 3rd Grade Math, only to drop to 5% in reading and 20% in math in 5th grade. Similarly, our SWD students start higher in the lower grade levels (40% proficiency in reading and 80% proficiency in math) only to drop in 5th grade (23% proficiency in reading and 8% proficiency in math). Looking at the Spring 2021 FSA Reading, only 24% of our 3rd graders (now in 4th grade) were proficient, compared to 0% of the SWD students in the same grade level. The 4th graders (now in 5th grade)' proficiency was 25% and only 14% of your SWD students were proficient. In Math, the Spring FSA scores show that the ELL group was 30% in 3rd grade compared to only 17% proficient in 4th grade. The SWD scored 13% in 3rd grade and 0% in 4th grade.

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

Based on the iReady progress monitoring and the 2019 state assessments, Math continues to be an area where students are underperforming. The i-Ready End of the Year (EOY) showed and overall Proficiency of 33%, compared to 39% in Reading. The overall proficiency is still low across all grade levels and subgroups in both, Reading and Math. Nonetheless, the SWD and the ELL student subgroups performed extremely low around 5% and 27% in 4th and 5th grades. The same trend can be observed in the 2021 FSA Math were 3rd grade had only 36% proficiency, and 4th grade had 39% proficiency.

### 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 school year 2020-2021 was especially challenging with students attending classes virtually or hybrid. The consistency of instruction suffered with technology issues and the required learning curve that teachers and students had to overcome. ELL students benefit from interacting with peers in English in order to diversify their vocabulary and acquire language skills; that was not possible for many of our students during the pandemic. Our SWD and ELL students require additional support that is best delivered in person. Barring the current pandemic, we expect to provide all students with additional support in the form of Tier 1/Core Support Teachers that will push into classrooms using a Support Facilitation model. In the area of Math, our school will be a pilot school that will implement the use of Symphony Math in all grade levels. The Symphony Math program will focus on math basic skills which in turn will improve basic proficiency in Math facilitating the instruction of more complex concepts.

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

Based on the 2019 data, all ESSA subgroups met and exceeded the minimum proficiency required to show improvement and close the achievement gap. Most importantly, the data component that showed the greatest gains was Science proficiency with an increase from 54% in 2018 to 60% in 2019 (+ 6%). The fifth grade team and an instructional coach worked side by side all year to disaggregate Performance Measurement Assessment (PMA) data and adjusted instruction accordingly. In addition, students were invited to a Science and Math Club where they were able to

practice the standards and reinforce concepts throughout the year. Currently, this past year the reading and math iReady diagnostics showed improvement from the Beginning of the Year (BOY) to the End of the Year (EOY) diagnostics. BOY Reading started proficiency at 17% and ended at 39%. Math started at 15% proficiency and ended at 33% proficiency.

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

One factor that contributed to this improvement was the steady return of the students to a face-to-face instructional model. The tutoring program (on weekdays and on Saturdays) served around 160 students thus supporting the lowest 25% and accelerating the instruction of bubble students.

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

Teachers will identify students that would benefit from the use of acceleration strategies based on the BOY iReady Diagnostic in reading and math. Specifically, an acceleration approach to math is used in the intervention block to allow students to be exposed to the standards prior to the actual standard being taught therefore increasing the time the students see the topic/content. With the support of Tier 1 Core Teachers during small groups, the teachers will be able to target the standards or benchmarks that need to be pre-taught. Forsyth Woods school will pilot a supplemental Math program (Symphony Math) that will provide the students with the opportunity to target and practice skills that were or will be pre-taught. We have a Scholastics Leveled Book Room that will be used to further enrich and accelerate student academic progress. Furthermore, our tutoring program, which serves about 150-160 students, will also pre-teach the standards and benchmarks following the District scope and sequence.

**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.**

We will continue iReady professional development for data disaggregation so teachers can create the small groups based on the students' needs in reading and math. Because our school is a pilot school for Symphony Math, our teachers will participate in professional development to guide them through the implementation of the program. To continue developing our staff's skills in Social Emotional Learning, our DPLC SELL Team will share the skills they learn during SELL training.

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

Even though Math will be our main focus, there is still support and acceleration strategies being used in reading. As for Math, an Intervention teacher focuses on supporting the lowest 30% of students in grades 3-5. Our Tier 1 Core teachers will support Core instruction (Tier 1) in grades K-5 in Reading and Math during small groups. An MTSS Coordinator will support the Tier 3 students (reading and/or math) to ensure students receive interventions needed to achieve.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Math proficiency dropped during the 2018/2019 school year from 66% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. Currently, based on the iReady Math Diagnostic, math proficiency sits at a 33% for grades 3- 5. Learning gains in math showed growth in 2019, but the overall proficiency in math fell to 32% in 2021. Our goal is to increase math proficiency to 66% to bring our school proficiency in line with our previous trajectory. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is an increase in math proficiency scores from 53% to 66% (increase of 13%) as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in Math. |
| **Monitoring:** | A progress-monitoring tool will be used by all classroom teachers to track iReady and Symphony Math diagnostics and checkpoints. PLCs will have scheduled data meetings to discuss progress or lack of progress and adjustments to instructional strategies after the conclusion of each CRM. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will use iReady math profile data and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small group intervention and acceleration to support the math standards. This data will be combined with the Symphony Math Benchmark assessments to finetune instruction and target skills. The lowest 30% of students in grades 3-5 will be served by a Math Intervention Teacher who will support the students' needs. Tier 1 Core teachers will support classroom teachers during whole and small group instruction to further tailor instruction to meet the needs of the students (acceleration and enrichment). |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale behind utilizing iReady profile and instructional grouping reports is to allow the teachers to create fluid groups of intervention based on actual student data and needs. As we learn more about Symphony Math, we will use their diagnostics to further fine tune the data and adjust instruction. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use iReady math profile and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small intervention groups. The iReady information will be compared to the Symphony Math Benchmark Assessment data to get a better picture of the students and their needs.

| **Person Responsible** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Teachers will administer iReady math diagnostic three times per year, Symphony Benchmarks, Standards Based Unit Assessments, and growth monitoring two times per year to utilize data and adjust small intervention groups.

| **Person Responsible** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Administration and members of the leadership team will monitor data and small intervention group data to make adjustments to instruction and grouping as needed.

| **Person Responsible** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Teachers will administer the three Symphony Math Benchmark assessments required for the implementation of the program. The additional information will be used to further fine tune academic instruction.

**Person Responsible**  Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

After-school tutoring will include targeted groups reinforcing and pre-teaching concepts already presented in
the classroom.

**Person Responsible**  Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Math learning gains during the 2018/2019 school year improved from 51% to 52%, an increase of 1%. The focus on student' learning gains will also impact and improve overall proficiency. Once the 2021 FSA Math scores are available, this goal may be adjusted. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is an increase of at least 8% in learning gains--from 52% to 60% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in Math. This measurable outcome might be adjusted once we receive the FSA scores. |
| **Monitoring:** | The same progress-monitoring tool will be used to identify the students' learning gain goals for the year based on the last FSA scores. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kimberly Hartley (kimberly.hartley@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | After-school tutoring will offer a focus on Math acceleration and reinforcement of concepts. Our instructional coaches will also be used to pull- out previously identified students during intervention/enrichment blocks. Additional support will be given to all students utilizing Culturally Responsive Instruction (communication of high- expectations, individualized and differentiated instruction taking into consideration native language and cultural preferences when it comes to Math). Symphony Math will be used to support math instruction and further address areas of need. (TDQs), and Academic Discourse. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for selecting this strategy will allow the leadership team and grade level math teams to analyze FSA data and i-Ready student profiles and determine action plans to fit the needs of the individual students. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Compare i-Ready EOY and FSA Math data to identify the students with the most needs.

| **Person Responsible** | Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Determine resources for intervention and tutoring.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Brief classroom teachers and receive input to create intervention and tutoring groups.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Monitor iReady math diagnostic, standards mastery, and growth monitoring data to adjust intervention groups as needed.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Administration and Instructional Coaches will participate in PLC's to ensure standards based instruction conversations and planning are taking place and assist where needed.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

Coaching Cycles for new teachers and teachers who have been identified as needing support based on observations conducted by administration and coaches.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net)

| | |
|---|---|
| **#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | To build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at Forsyth Woods Elementary School with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject matter material. By ensuring that Forsyth Woods Elementary School has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: decrease students with lower than 90% attendance rates and foster an environment of acceptance and learning. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We will decrease the number of students with lower than 90% attendance rates and foster an environment of acceptance and learning. |
| **Monitoring:** | - Improvement in EWS Attendance data<br>- Panorama survey data<br>- Cognia survey data<br>- Anticipated impact of a culture and climate of student achievement |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Forsyth Woods Elementary School will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. A plan of action will be modified based on data, student needs and adult needs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model Forsyth Woods Elementary School can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional and academic development of every student. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Continue developing a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |

Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net) |

| #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | On the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 64% of our students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 16 percentage points from 36% to 52%. |
| **Monitoring:** | A progress-monitoring tool is used by all classroom teachers to track iReady and CRM summative assessments at the conclusion of each CRM. PLCs will have scheduled data meetings to discuss progress or lack of progress and adjustments to instructional strategies after the conclusion of each CRM. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will use iReady reading profile data and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small group intervention and acceleration to support the reading standards. This data will be combined with the CRM summative assessments to further identify the specific standards and target skills the students need to improve. The students in grades 1-5 will be served during an FBS Walk-to intervention model designed to work on the students' needs in different domains identified using iReady data (i.e., phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension). Tier 1 Core teachers will support classroom teachers during whole and small group instruction to further tailor instruction to meet the needs of the students (acceleration and enrichment). |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale behind utilizing iReady profile and instructional grouping reports is to allow the teachers to create fluid groups of intervention based on actual student data and needs. Data meetings are conducted after the conclusion of each CRM and intervention groups are adjusted as needed based on the assessment results. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use iReady reading profile and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small intervention groups.

| **Person Responsible** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Teachers will administer iReady reading diagnostic three times per year, growth monitoring two times per year, and CRM Standards Based Unit Assessments to utilize data and adjust small intervention groups.

| **Person Responsible** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Administration and members of the leadership team will monitor data and small intervention group data to make adjustments to instruction and grouping as needed.

| **Person Responsible** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

After-school tutoring will include targeted groups reinforcing and pre-teaching concepts already presented in
the classroom.

| **Person Responsible** | Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

## 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.

**For the year 2019, Forsyth Woods reported 1.3 incidents per 100 students, compared to the State average of 1.0 per 100 students. Specifically, the violent incident rate was 1.09 per 100 students-- this rate is considered above the state average of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. We will continue to apply Social Emotional SELL strategies to foster relationship with students. By implementing and monitoring SELL strategies we will be proactive in identifying at-risk students and providing services and interventions as needed.**

## 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.

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.

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success.

Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support student success.

A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy.

Schools utilize staff such as the Parent Engagement Liaison to bridge the community and school culture.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | $50,000.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 3610 | 100-Salaries | 1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary | Title, I Part A | | $50,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Before and after school tutoring costs for the 2021/2022 school year. | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | $78,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | 100-Salaries | 1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary | Title, I Part A | | $78,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Math intervention teacher salary. | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | $1,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 1141 | 341000-SUPPLIES - GENERAL | 1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary | School Improvement Funds | | $1,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Creating Cool Off corners for each classroom with supplies. | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | $0.00 |
| | | | | | Total: | $129,000.00 |