

Seminole County Public Schools

Forest City 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Forest City Elementary School

1010 SAND LAKE RD, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Avellino, Joseph	Principal	Instructional Leader
Keating, Julie	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Baptist, Amanda	Administrative Support	Title I Compliance, Student Discipline, Business Partners, Student Study Team, Facilities
Gill, Shannon	Graduation Coach	ELA 3-5, MTSS
Rosenberg, Cindy	Instructional Coach	ELA K-2, MTSS
Fennel, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Math/Science K-5, MTSS, iReady, New Teacher Support
Moore, Ashlay	School Counselor	Student Study, MTSS, SEL and Mental Health

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.

The School Improvement Plan is shared with SAC and PTO members. Suggestions are taken and stakeholders have the opportunity to add their input and recommendations. Items may be shared through School Messenger, social media, and the school website.

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))

FCE will follow a systematic approach to monitoring and revising the School Improvement Plan and aims to achieve continuous improvement and ultimately close the achievement gap for all students, ensuring they meet the State's academic standards.

1. FCE will collect relevant academic data, including standardized test scores, formative and summative assessments, attendance rates, graduation rates, and any other relevant metrics. This data will be analyzed to identify trends, patterns, and areas of concern.
2. FCE will identify and focus on specific student groups that are experiencing the greatest achievement gap. This includes students from low-income families, English language learners, students with disabilities, and African American students who show lower performance compared to their peers.
3. FCE will conduct frequent progress monitoring to assess the effectiveness of the implemented strategies and interventions. This may involve regular meetings with teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders to review data and discuss the outcomes of the interventions.
4. Based on the data analysis, FCE will make necessary adjustments and revisions to the SIP. This may include modifying instructional approaches, allocating resources differently, or implementing new interventions targeted at specific student needs.
5. FCE will involve various stakeholders, including teachers, parents, community members, and students, in the monitoring and revision process. Input from these stakeholders will be valuable in identifying effective strategies and ensuring a collaborative approach to continuous improvement.
6. To support the successful implementation of the SIP, FCE will provide professional development opportunities for teachers and staff. This training will equip educators with the necessary skills and knowledge to address the unique needs of students and improve instruction.

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	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	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	11	33	30	22	23	21	0	0	0	140	
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	4	4	5	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	12	13	3	1	4	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in Math	1	14	9	5	3	3	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	30	0	0	0	57	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	29	0	0	0	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	16	13	16	19	21	0	0	0	87	

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	2	17	16	5	24	30	0	0	0	94

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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	5	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	4	15	9	2	1	4	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in Math	4	13	7	4	1	6	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	12	20	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	13	25	0	0	0	46	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	13	11	27	0	0	0	0	0	53	

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	4	12	7	5	0	11	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	9	2	13	5	5	0	0	0	38
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	5	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	4	15	9	2	1	4	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in Math	4	13	7	4	1	6	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	12	20	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	13	25	0	0	0	46	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	13	11	27	0	0	0	0	0	53	

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	4	12	7	5	0	11	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	9	2	13	5	5	0	0	0	38
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*	58	61	53	64	65	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				57			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			56		
Math Achievement*	60	64	59	60	46	50	55		
Math Learning Gains				55			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			50		
Science Achievement*	59	65	54	53	65	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	88	77	59	85			79		

* 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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	26	Yes	4	1
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	64			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	68			

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%
FRL	59			

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	39	Yes	3	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	60			
MUL	48			
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	58			60			59					88
SWD	27			30			22				4	
ELL	32			47			59				4	88
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46			57			40				4	
HSP	56			58			60				5	88
MUL	33			50							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	73			65			67				4	
FRL	52			56			53				5	88

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	64	57	40	60	55	44	53					85
SWD	25	33	33	28	40	42	30					80
ELL	61	68		52	57		37					85
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	50	50	51	47	44	47					
HSP	65	60	40	61	58	58	53					83
MUL	50			46								
PAC												
WHT	71	56	31	64	55	29	62					
FRL	60	53	33	55	51	41	49					86

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	61	58	56	55	48	50	46					79
SWD	38	53	50	42	50	58	7					
ELL	64	64	55	53	33	45	32					79
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	47		41	40		39					
HSP	62	58	50	53	39	44	38					81
MUL	82			55								
PAC												
WHT	63	60		68	60		59					
FRL	59	59	47	52	49	47	39					82

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	58%	61%	-3%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	66%	-3%	58%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	60%	-10%	50%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	66%	-1%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	68%	-10%	61%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	44%	8%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	64%	-8%	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.

According to iReady and FAST data, the greatest need for improvement in ELA for grades K-2 is comprehension (informational text) and number sense in math. In grades 3-5, the greatest need for improvement in ELA is vocabulary and comprehension (informational text) and number sense and geometric reasoning.

Data shows a need to close the achievement gap for ELL students, ESE students, and African American students.,

Comprehension is essential for understanding and analyzing written information. The need for improvement in this area may be attributed to insufficient instruction and practice focused on developing comprehension skills. Teachers may need to implement more targeted strategies and resources to enhance students' ability to comprehend and critically evaluate informational texts.

Vocabulary plays a crucial role in reading comprehension and academic success. The need for improvement in vocabulary may arise from limited exposure to diverse and challenging words. Teachers can address this by incorporating vocabulary-building activities across subjects and grade levels, encouraging students to read a wide range of texts, and providing explicit instruction in vocabulary development.

Number sense and geometric reasoning are foundational math skills. The need for improvement in these areas may result from a lack of emphasis on conceptual understanding and real-world applications of math concepts. Teachers can use hands-on activities, manipulatives, and problem-solving tasks to strengthen students' number sense and geometric reasoning skills.

Forest City will create a schedule that meets the needs of all students and limits missed instructional time in the general education classroom. Schedules for literacy teachers will be created to ensure a balanced approach to literacy which includes a daily guided reading block. Also, review of progress monitoring will be done during the PLC time to make instructional decisions including intervention decisions. All students will receive intervention time in math four days a week. Teachers will use data discussed at PLC from progress monitors and formative assessments to determine targeted skills. Professional development will be provided to all faculty and staff that focuses on building stronger relationships with students in order to raise student achievement.

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

According to FAST test results, third grade ELA showed the greatest decline. Third grade ELA proficiency decreased from 68% to 50%. There are a variety of factors that could have contributed to this decline.

1. New standardized test
2. New testing platform
3. Lack of early literacy development
4. Inadequate reading instruction
5. Family or Socioeconomic challenges- transient population

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.

4th grade math had the only gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students with disabilities.

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

The most improvement based on state assessments was science achievement. Forest City Elementary improved from 49% to 56% proficiency.

Some contributing factors to this improvement was placing science on the wheel. Teachers collaborated with the science teacher to discuss instructional decisions based on the science benchmarks and formative assessments. Based on data collected from the 5 Essentials Survey, students enjoyed this weekly class, were motivated to learn, and were better able to connect learning to real life scenerios. Forest City also made some personnel changes in fifth grade math/science which allowed for better

relationships amongst the team and with the students. For the 23-24 school year, fifth grade will act as a trifecta meaning each team will be comprised of an ELA/SS teacher, a math teacher, and a science teacher. By departmentalizing, it allows teachers to specialize in specific subjects, which means they can develop a deeper understanding and expertise in those areas that will lead to a higher quality of instruction and more in-depth learning experiences for students. Students will receive more targeted and comprehensive instruction in each subject. Teachers will focus on designing engaging and age-appropriate lessons tailored to the specific needs and abilities of the students in each subject area.

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

FCE's highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming school year are as follows:

1. High Standards and Student Achievement: Improve student proficiency
2. Conditions for Learning: Foster stronger relationships between teachers and students

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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based 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.)

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, iReady or iStation, Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools), Reading Mastery, FastForward, Corrective Reading, Quick Reads and Elements of Reading.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

What do we want all students to do?

All Students are proficient ELA/Math. The aim of accelerating achievement of the lower30%, SWD, ELL and tiered students is to close the achievement gap to ensure that all students have the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college, career, and life, regardless of their starting point.

How will we know if they learn it?

Teachers meet in PLC s weekly to analyze data from core instruction using formative and summative assessment for both core and intervention instruction. Progress Monitoring will be ongoing and tracked at a minimum of three times per year for analysis to guide classroom and support instruction .

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

Provide differentiated instruction: Teachers will use differentiated instruction to tailor their teaching to the individual needs of lower performing students. This can include varying the pace and level of instruction, incorporating multi-modal learning activities, and providing additional opportunities for practice and feedback.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?

iReady Report Subgroups, ESSA, and RAISE tracked data from FAST progress monitoring

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5 Essentials Survey indicators for trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism will increase to or remain Well Organized.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.)

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Initiate strategies to build trusting relationships between students and qualified adults. Instructional staff will be provided with professional development including modeling of proven methods for listening to students, asking/acknowledging questions, and building student-teacher relationships while fostering an atmosphere of trust. Teachers will use PBIS activities and lessons/initiatives to ensure students' well-being.

Strategies to improve relationships Listen to students, ask questions, respond intentionally, acknowledge

students feelings, advocate for individuals, open up to students, get to know your students, develop a classroom/school wide atmosphere of trust. Utilize Sanford Harmony and behavioral intervention group meetings with targeted students and topics for discussion.

To establish a sense of collective responsibility among the faculty members towards student learning and success through collaborative planning and support.

Steps:

1. Conduct a meeting with the faculty members to discuss the survey results and the importance of collective responsibility in improving student learning outcomes.
2. Develop a strategic plan that includes setting shared goals for student achievement, establishing a collaborative planning time, and providing regular opportunities for collaborative support and reflection.
3. Establish protocols for grade-level team collaboration that includes sharing best practices, analyzing assessment data to inform instruction, and identifying students in need of targeted interventions.
4. Assign faculty members with shared responsibilities such as monitoring academic progress of identified students, analyzing data, troubleshooting common issues, and providing support and feedback to each other.
5. Foster a culture of open communication and support by organizing regular meetings and opportunities for sharing feedback and experiences.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

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).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).

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 School Improvement Plan is shared with SAC and PTO members. Suggestions are taken and stakeholders have the opportunity to add their input and recommendations. Items may be shared through School Messenger, social media, and the school website.

<https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0502>

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))

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

<https://forestcity.scps.k12.fl.us/>

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)

FCE will aim to provide assistance to economically disadvantaged students, so they may have access to high-quality education aligned to the state's academic standards. To strength the academic program and increase the quality of learning time and curriculum.

The following are some strategies that FCE will follow:

1. FCE will implement research-based practices, including innovative instructional tactics and assessments tools, to improve student achievement.
2. FCE will use data to drive instructional tactics and assessment tools, to improve student achievement.
3. FCE will offer regular professional development opportunities for teachers to improve their instructional practices and enhance student learning.
4. FCE will provide students with additional time for learning through before and/or after school programs designed to enrich and accelerate curriculum.
5. FCE will work closely with families and community organizations to support and enhance learning opportunities for students, provide access to academic resources and offer workshops designed to help parents support their children's education.

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))

During the planning phase of Title I school-wide plans, which typically begins late February or early March for the upcoming school year, leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), ESOL World Languages and Student Access (Title III, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Student Assignment and Program Access (magnet programs), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK) are invited to participate in collaborative planning sessions. At these collaborative planning sessions, school leadership teams begin developing their Title I, Part A plans for the upcoming school year, with support and guidance from these various district-level grant and/or program managers. For instance, the Director of ESOL/World Languages and Student Access would share with Title I school leadership teams relevant updates to those programs for the upcoming school year, which may lead them to leverage their Title I, Part A funds to supplement such initiatives.