

Orange County Public Schools

Forsyth Woods Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Forsyth Woods Elementary

6651 CURTIS ST, Orlando, FL 32807

<https://forsythwoodses.ocps.net/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation 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.
Lipschutz, Lindsey	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 of the Curriculum Resource Teacher include supporting teachers and classroom instruction by providing resources and information about the new B.E.S.T. Standards for Reading and Math, the guidance necessary to implement testing, and supporting the implementation of quality Math instruction.
Hartley, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	The job duties and responsibilities of the Instructional Coach is to support the SIP action plan by supporting the classroom teachers with new initiatives and strategies to improve student achievement. Mrs. Hartley provides a clear plan to mentor new teachers to support quality instruction and impact student achievement.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

During SAC meetings, stakeholders (including school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, families, and business or community leaders) helped identify ESSA area of improvements based on the school's performance on each accountability indicator. Identified areas of need are analyzed and prioritized to ensure SIP goals are created, implemented and monitored.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement through classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, common planning, staff feedback and data meetings. The SIP will be revised as necessary based on data to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	86%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	15	25	27	26	25	28	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	6	6	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	8	5	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	23	16	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	28	19	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	13	21	23	0	0	0	0	70

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	6	14	33	18	0	0	0	80

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	14	30	39	28	30	31	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	22	26	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	21	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	11	15	0	0	0	37
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	18	22	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	14	30	39	28	30	31	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	22	26	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	18	21	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	11	15	0	0	0	37
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	18	22	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	46	57	53	50	56	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				67			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			43		
Math Achievement*	47	60	59	52	46	50	32		
Math Learning Gains				66			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			10		
Science Achievement*	63	63	54	52	61	59	26		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	59	59	52			46		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	253
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	2	2
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	50			
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	46			47			63					58
SWD	9			25			30				4	44
ELL	40			42			52				5	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			50							2	
HSP	41			47			60				5	55

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48			36							4	75
FRL	46			45			61				5	60

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	50	67	51	52	66	40	52					52
SWD	10	43	40	17	38	38	10					45
ELL	39	62	48	45	61	36	29					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			50								
HSP	50	68	52	51	67	45	50					51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43	60		52	55							57
FRL	51	69	53	50	66	41	53					47

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	36	32	43	32	20	10	26					46
SWD	11	33		12	14	10	0					48
ELL	26	27	43	24	29	9	11					46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			31								
HSP	35	29	35	32	23	13	25					46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	21			13								42

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	33	34	41	29	21	12	18					44

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	54%	-10%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	60%	1%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	30%	52%	-22%	50%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	59%	-17%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	51%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends.

The overall proficiency in grades 3-5 based on the Spring 2023 FAST ELA, went from 50% to 51%. Math proficiency declined from 52% to 49%. Although our math data components were the lowest, we did see tremendous improvement in proficiency from the 2022-23 FAST PM1 to 2022-23 FAST PM2 in ELA and Math. Overall grades 3-5 FAST Math proficiency when comparing PM1 to PM3 improved +23% from 22% to 45%. ELA (+23%) and Math (+46%) learning gains show tremendous improvement. The SWD students underperformed this year in Reading in all grade levels- SWD proficiency was 30% based on ESSA ATSI data.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Math proficiency based on the Spring 2023 FAST showed the greatest decline from prior year from 52% to 49%. This decline is primarily due to students struggling with basic math foundational skills and the need for more differentiation and small group instruction to help bridge the learning gaps. There is also a need for a strong focus on tier 1 instruction during the 45 minute math block to help support an increase in proficiency in K-5 math.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

State ELA gap comparison of Students with Disabilities when compared to Students without Disabilities showed 36 percentage points gap based on the FLDOE. State Math gap comparison of Students with Disabilities when compared to Students without Disabilities showed a 30 percentage point gap. <https://edudata.fldoe.org/StrategicPlan/reports/ClosingTheGap.html>. This is a common trend throughout the state and in many schools.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Fifth grade science FCAT scores showed the most improvement with proficiency going from 52% to 63%. In order to improve achievement in this area, we discussed standard based unit assessments during PLC's and identified standards needing reteaching. We also strategically guarded the 5th grade science block and increased direct instruction of science vocabulary. Coaches observed and identified teachers in need of additional support to improve instructional delivery. Co-teaching was an intervention used frequently to help instructional delivery.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency is the biggest area of concern based on the EWS data from Part 1. This correlates with our need to increase proficiency through a strong focus on Tier 1 instruction and supports.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase proficiency in all grades in both Reading and Math through a focus on small group instruction.
2. Focus on bubble students who are at a level 2 and with support, FBS, tutoring, etc. to move them to proficiency.
3. Focus on the lowest 30% of students in ELA and math to increase learning gains.
4. Focus on increasing proficiency in ELA and math with SWD.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

One subgroup where we underperformed is the SWD student group. In order to improve our overall proficiency, and learning gains of the lowest 25%, we need to target this group during classroom instruction, small group, and intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will increase our SWD ESSA subgroup proficiency level from 30% to 50% in ELA.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor by tracking SBUA, Exact Path and SuccessMaker as well as quarterly assessments to determine academic needs and adjust classroom instruction, small groups, and intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will use Exact Path and SuccessMaker that will provide data points on intervention and grade level content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Monitoring academic performance will allow the teachers to pinpoint areas of need and determine whether the SWD are progressing or not. By providing professional development on the best practices to help SWD, the teachers will gain confidence in accommodating the needs of the SWD in their daily instruction in the classroom.

Both programs are grounded in research. Both Exact Path and SuccessMaker have substantial evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in yielding enhanced student performance. The data collected from these programs contains formative and progress monitoring assessments for multiple data points to be considered.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Discuss SWD academic performance during PLCs and possible student tasks to accommodate the SWD during classroom instruction, small groups, and interventions.

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

By When: Ongoing

The ESE department will provide additional training to teachers on the best instructional delivery practices that benefit SWD and ways to incorporate IEP goals in their lesson planning.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Print off all student IEP's in grades K-5 and house these IEP's in the students homeroom class. Having this in print will ensure all classroom teachers, Tier 1 teachers, ELL paras, leadership team members, Tier 3 supports and administrators can quickly identify students IEPs and then efficiently provide accommodations.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Conduct data meetings on SWD subgroup in grades 3-5 with all supporting personnel to monitor progress and make changes to instruction, intervention and small group as needed.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Create a SWD group in Successmaker and Exact Path and monitor usage and progress in grades K-2 and 3-5.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly

Attend school and district provided PD on Exact Path and Success Maker.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Creating and maintaining a positive Parent and Family Engagement team effectively links families to vital district, school and community resources during the year. Encouraging parents, families, students, staff and community members to learn and work together will ensure an increase in student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Through creating and maintaining a positive Parent and Family Engagement team, students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency on ELA FAST from 51% to 65%. Students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency on Math FAST from 49% to 64%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor student improvement with our progress monitoring tool. We will be monitoring SBUA, district and state assessments to inform instructional adjustments in small group instruction and intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

During PLCs, teachers will discuss classroom, district, and state assessments to ensure that small group instruction and intervention is responsive to student needs. Teachers and school staff will build relationships with families to effectively communicate individual student progress and needs. Teachers and school staff will ensure families are aware of and able to access vital district, school and community resources during the year to ensure student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Some parents may not be aware of these additional supports provided to parents and families. With access to these supports parents and families will be able to effectively engage in their child's education in order for their child to achieve at the highest academic level.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide information to parents about district provided workshops and family learning events.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Multicultural Night, Math/Science Night, Literacy Night

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

By When: 10/13/23, 4/10/24, 2/28/24

The Parent Engagement Liaison will work to bridge support with parents, families and school by translating when needed, partnering with the community and supporting parents to increase parents use of parent access and launchpad.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

School-wide implementation of TalkingPoints which communicates to families in their preferred language.

Person Responsible: Lindsey Lipschutz (lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math continues to be the content area of lowest academic proficiency. Even though we made positive gains, we need to continue improving the students math foundation and proficiency. Students oftentimes feel they are not good in math and do not see the real world application of what they are learning. We as teachers, need to make a better effort to engage our students and make Math more attainable through small group instruction. Most of our teachers might not feel comfortable with Math concepts nor know how to best reach the students so they learn to love and be challenged by Math. We want to promote persistence when tackling Math problems so students are not discouraged when they make mistakes. Mistakes should be learning tools.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will improve Math proficiency from 49% to 65% (+16%) when comparing 2023 FAST PM3 data to 2024 FAST PM3 data in grades 3-5.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor progress using a data monitoring tool to track SBUA, district assessments, and state assessments. We will monitor the students progress on SuccessMaker to follow their progress or lack of it through the program stages. We will also use classroom observations of student tasks to gauge implementation of best practices during small group Math instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will differentiate instruction through small group instruction in the math block and math intervention block.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to engage the students during Math instruction, teachers will have to implement student tasks in small group that are relevant and support the content (benchmark) thus supporting the instructional core and positively impacting student achievement. Professional development will be extended during PLCs giving the teachers the opportunity to discuss small group. We will begin using SuccessMaker Math which is a program that focuses on basic math skills, providing the students with additional practice opportunities.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 for teachers on SuccessMaker.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Snell (lindsay.snell@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Pull tier 1 bubble students in grades 3-5 for additional small group support.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Snell (lindsay.snell@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing based on data and need

Provide actionable feedback to teachers based on classroom walkthroughs and data in regards to effective small group instruction

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

By When: Ongoing

Support during PLCs discussing the benchmarks and appropriate student tasks to deliver small group instruction.

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

By When: Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Describe district needs based review of allocations. This process should include a review of the use of the school's resources supported by all funding sources (federal, state and local), including both general funds and funds dedicated to school improvement activities. Determine any lack of resources (people, time and money) contributing to low performance and how it will be addressed

SuccessMaker and Exact Path are new district purchased programs. Time will be needed for teachers and support staff to learn these new programs and how to pull reports to monitor usage and student progress. The district has also provided schools with the program Number Sense which supports students needing Tier 3 support in math. A barrier with this program is time and the ability for 1 classroom teacher to teach the various levels that may be needed during the allotted 30 minute math intervention block. Supports are in place to help our Tier 3 math students.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

When analyzing our 2022-23 EOY data 66% of our kindergarten students were proficient based on Early Literacy Assessment. In 1st grade 47% were proficient based on STAR Reading. In 2nd grade 48% of students were proficient based on FAST ELA PM3. Our focus for K-2 Instructional Practice is for students to develop awareness of the segments of sound in speech and how they link to letters.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

When analyzing our 2022-23 EOY data only 30% of our 3rd students were proficient based on FAST ELA data. 62% of our 4th graders were proficient and 44% of our 5th graders were proficient based on the FAST ELA data. A focus on differentiation through small groups to meet individual student needs will continue

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Students in K-2 will show 1 years growth based on the new Exact Path program. Our goal is to have 75% of students in Kindergarten to be proficient based on PM3 using Early Literacy. 1st grade goal is to reach 60% proficiency as measured by PM3 based on Star Reading. 2nd grade goal is to reach 60% proficiency based on FAST ELA PM3

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students in grades 3-5 will show 1 years growth based on the new Exact Path program. Students identified as a level 1 or level 2 on FAST will increase at least 1 level from FAST PM1 to FAST ELA

PM3. 3rd grade goal is to reach 60% proficiency based on FAST ELA PM3. 4th grade goal is to reach 65% based on FAST ELA PM3. 5th grade goal is to reach 65% based on FAST ELA PM3.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators . Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Cadre leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBBLES, SIPPS progress monitoring data and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Maldonado, Kelly, kelly.maldonado@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The programs listed below are evidence-based programs, being implemented to significantly improve student outcomes. These programs develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly. They are also aligned to the B.E.S.T ELA Standards and OCPS K-12 Reading Plan.

Heggerty
Being a Reader
OCPS Multisensory Kits
Exact Path

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These resources have been vetted by OCPS district ELA team to address the identified need have a proven record of effectiveness for our targeted population. If used with fidelity we are confident that the use of these programs will have a positive impact on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Implementation of Being a Reader, Heggerty, Exact Path and Multisensory Kits during ELA. During PLCs coaches will work with teachers to identify student needs and what evidence based programs will best support.</p> <p>Use and analysis of: -FAST -Heggerty Assessments -District created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -DIBELS (K-1) -Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3) -SIPPS Formative Data (K-5)</p> <p>Use of data to determine interventions and support needs of students</p>	<p>Lipschutz, Lindsey, lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net</p>
<p>Coaches will provide professional development, coaching and feedback as needed to ensure a successful implementation. District PD options available include the Instructional Literacy Institute, literacy coach meetings, K-5 ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction PD</p>	<p>Lipschutz, Lindsey, lindsey.lipschutz@ocps.net</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be shared, discussed and adjusted based on data analysis and input from stakeholders (students, families, school staff, leadership and local businesses and organizations) throughout the school year. Examples of subgroup data and overall types of discussed or reviewed during SAC (not limited to): SBUA, Successmaker, FAST, Exact Path, Write Score, or ACCESS. The SIP will also be posted on the school's webpage at https://forsythwoods.es.ocps.net/parents1/sac__and_school_improvement_plan

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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. Taking care of the decision making and character building of our students by actively fostering positive relationships between teacher mentors and students. 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. A copy of Forsyth Woods Family Engagement Plan can be found at https://forsythwoods.es.ocps.net/parents1/parent_and_family_engagement_plan

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Forsyth Woods plans to strengthen the academic program in the school and increase the amount and quality of learning time through differentiating instruction in small group. This small group instruction will allow for enrichment time and/or access to an accelerated curriculum. Students showing an additional need for enrichment from various data points may also be supported by our gifted teacher. Successmaker and Exact Path, which are online adaptive learning programs, also provide individualized enrichment opportunities based on students' performances on placement from diagnostic tests or screeners.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Students at Forsyth Woods receive free meals during the 2023-2024 school year. This is being offered through the USDA's Community Eligibility Provision program or CEP. We also offer 2 full day Pre-K programs and a tutoring program for targeted students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Students are provided weekly classroom guidance lessons during the Health block. Each classroom has a Cool-Off-Corner and students are shown how to utilize this self-regulation technique. Students needing additional support are provided small group counseling by the school counselor or community-based support with parent/guardian consent. Students with extreme need are provided with individualized counseling by our school counselor or a referral for individualized counseling by an outside provider.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Students with behavior struggles are tiered based on data collection and professional observation. Students at a Tier 2 level receive small group intervention with parent/guardian consent. Students at a Tier 3 level receive individualized support and/or referrals for outside services with parent/guardian consent.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

All teachers and support staff will be provided professional development in our new district adopted adaptive online programs SuccessMaker and Exact Path. Other professional learning and activities will be determined based on individual teacher need and/or data suggesting this would help support student achievement.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Students in preschool are provided a full day preschool program vs. the traditional 1/2 day programs supported by the state. Students at Forsyth Woods are also given the option to attend a summer opportunity to wrap around to kindergarten to help transition to local elementary school programs.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$250.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
			1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary	Title, I Part A	\$250.00	
		<i>Notes: Parent Orientation for SWD - night to meet ESE Resource Team and give details of how students will be supported throughout the year.</i>				
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$2,000.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
			1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary	Title, I Part A	\$2,000.00	
		<i>Notes: Invite parent and families to school for workshops on various topics, such as Parent Access, MPLS, SAC, How to Help in Reading/Math, etc.</i>				
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$80,000.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
			1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary	Title, I Part A	\$80,000.00	
		<i>Notes: Provide afterschool tutoring/enrichment to support reading/math instruction to help student reach proficient levels.</i>				
Total:					\$82,250.00	

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes