Forest Lake Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Forest Lake Elementary School

1600 DOYLE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/forestlake/pages/default.aspx

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

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 mission of our Forest Lake Elementary Community is to provide a learning environment where all students can achieve academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Sojka, Michelle	Principal	Instructional Leader - provide feedback to teachers on instruction, provide and lead curriculum, planning, and data reviews, monitor implementation of school-based initiatives, schedule and lead professional learning on teacher clarity, small group instruction, planning, and PBIS expectations
LUEBBERT, RACHEAL	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader - provide feedback to teachers on instruction, provide and lead curriculum, planning, and data reviews, monitor implementation of school-based initiatives, schedule and lead professional learning on teacher clarity, small group instruction, planning, and PBIS expectations
Grant, Bridgette	Teacher, K-12	Intermediate teacher and 4th grade team leader- implement lesson plans at appropriate levels of rigor and use manipulatives and hands on activities where appropriate Facilitate Saturday bootcamps to provide remediation to students in need Use ongoing progress monitoring data to drive future instruction
Boulware, Kelly	Teacher, ESE	ESE Support Facilitation teacher and ESE Team Lead - implement lessons that target IEP goals and grade level benchmarks/standards to support SWD and our ESSA subgroup.
Carson, Julia	Instructional Coach	Provide training to teachers on curriculum resources, observe teachers implementing instruction and assessment and provide feedback and support on instructional strategies. use ongoing progress monitoring data to drive future instruction with focus on ESSA subgroups, Intervention, Enrichment, Small/Whole Groups, and data chats. She will also use this same data and direction from Admin to drive Coaching cycles. Coach will work closely with Administration to provide PLC time for standards-aligned lesson planning/pacing/identifying focus standards. Lead vertical learning walks with purpose of addressing teacher personal growth
Turner, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Academic Intervention teacher - will assist with monitoring and tutoring for LQ and ESSA subgroup students

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.

Once approved, we will present our SIP plan for SY 2023 - 2024 to all stakeholders. We will revise and make appropriate revisions based on feedback received.

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))

We will monitor progress on our Areas of Focus during Monthly SLT meetings as well as through the Stocktake process. We will revise and make appropriate revisions as needed in order to impact student achievement.

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	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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) 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: C
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	0	18	16	9	16	13	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	7	3	7	6	6	0	0	0	29
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	20	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	8	12	15	8	0	0	0	58

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	7	4	5	10	16	0	0	0	42

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	2	0	2	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	13	7	14	9	20	14	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	5	5	5	15	14	11	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	7	4	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	22	16	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	28	23	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	10	22	10	15	12	0	0	0	79
	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	2	6	11	10	20	13	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	13	7	14	9	20	14	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	5	5	5	15	14	11	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	7	4	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	22	16	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	28	23	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	10	22	10	15	12	0	0	0	79
	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	2	6	11	10	20	13	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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*	49	52	53	57	53	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				65			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			53		
Math Achievement*	57	55	59	54	42	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				58			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			24		
Science Achievement*	58	62	54	60	55	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	60	59	67			55		

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	276
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462
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	23	Yes	1	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	4	
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			
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	41			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	55			

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	49			57			58					60
SWD	14			25			19				5	40
ELL	31			46			37				5	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			39			43				3	
HSP	48			54			48				5	51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51			58			63				4	
FRL	43			53			55				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	57	65	51	54	58	50	60					67
SWD	21	52	45	26	56	57	17					54
ELL	39	59	27	39	56	40	46					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	48		29	39		17					
HSP	58	70	33	51	61	53	62					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	63	65	73	60	60	53	71					
FRL	56	65	48	49	54	46	56					63

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	55	52	53	47	38	24	47					55
SWD	18	64		12	55							50
ELL	46	47		42	24		33					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			27								
HSP	47	59	60	45	31	18	34					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	44		51	36		57					
FRL	51	49	43	43	35	29	46					49

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	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	57%	-6%	58%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	57%	11%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	59%	-9%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	61%	-4%	51%	6%

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.

In reviewing our data, our Black/African American ESSA subgroup has been our lowest performing group for the last two consecutive years. Assessment results demonstrated a 1% decrease to 33% from the previous. This is consistent with previous year as evidenced by the fact that they have score less than 41% for at least three years despite focused interventions. We will continue monitoring the performance of our SWD as their performance data results yielded 41%, a 2% increase from the previous year. One contributing factor is that many of our veteran teachers are struggling to incorporate instructional strategies that meet the needs of our AA and SWD subgroups. We will work with District staff to increase faculty and staff awareness of the needs of these subgroups as well as provide time for collaborative planning and professional development/coaching to build capacity in this area.

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

There was a noticeable decline in ELA performance results. The greatest decline was in 5th grade ELA, which decreased 11% to 52%. The second area of concern was in 4th grade ELA which dropped by 3% to 51%. The factors that contributed to this decline was a shift in focus to Math and Science. In addition, there was more intentional instruction in Math due to the implementation of BEST math Benchmarks as

well as the Big Ideas in math instructional resources. With respect to our SWDs, a contributing factor would be having 3 high needs programs which included EBD, ASD, and Mild-VE. The scores of these students contribute to a larger drop in scores in comparison to schools without specialized programs. Additionally, last year we have had some cross over between subgroups when it comes to SWDs and AA subgroups. Some students may have influenced both subgroups showing a more rapid decline. The noticeable trend is that ELA decreased across grade levels.

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 ELA showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average, given the fact that the students at Forest Lake demonstrated a proficiency of 51% compared to the state average of 58%, which equals a difference of 7% . The factors that contributed to this decline was a shift in focus to Math and Science. In addition, there was more intentional instruction in Math due to the implementation of BEST math Benchmarks as well as the Big Ideas in math instructional resources. With respect to our SWDs, a contributing factor would be having 3 high needs programs which included EBD, ASD, and Mild-VE. The scores of these students contribute to a larger drop in scores in comparison to schools without specialized programs. Additionally, last year we have had some cross over between subgroups when it comes to SWDs and AA subgroups. Some students may have influenced both subgroups showing a more rapid decline.

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

Our students demonstrated the most improvement in math achievement. We implemented the new BEST benchmarks, the new curriculum resources of Big Ideas in math, increased Math intervention and remediation to twice per day based on targeted data. In addition, implemented Saturday Math camps which were benchmark driven over an 8 week period leading up to PM3.

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

Discipline especially with regard to AA and SWDs and attendance.

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

1) Collaborative Planning including data-driven PLC organized with SMART goals
2) Learning Gains - WIN/Intervention groups
3) Coaching cycles to align with Teacher/Student need
4) Build community culture and involvement among our teachers and families especially with regarding our AA and SWD families.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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.

Our Area of Focus is aligned with District Strategic Plan Goal 1: engage all students in high levels of learning. Our Needs Assessment and Data Analysis revealed that our ELA Proficiency decreased by 6 points to 51%. Further analysis revealed that the ESSA Subgroup of BLK yielded a proficiency of 33%. Our proficiency in Math increased by 3 points to 57% while our proficiency in Science decreased by 3 points to 57%.

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

Increase overall ELA Achievement by 5 percentage points to 62%. Increase ELA
Learning Gains by 2 percentage points to 74% and increase ELA LQ Learning Gains by 2 percentage points to 58%.

Increase overall Math Achievement by 10 percentage points to 62%. Increase Math
Learning Gains by 2 percentage points to 74% and increase Math LQ Learning Gains by 2 percentage points to 58%.

Increase overall Science Achievement by 10 percentage points to 65%.

The expected teacher outcome is that their class will reach the proficiency goals for ELA (62%), Math (59%), and Science (65%). Student progress will be monitored monthly, as teachers review new data and make predictions on student performance on PM 3. Coaching cycles will be implemented based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. As a result of professional development, coaching cycles, and feedback from Administration, teacher effectiveness in the area of teacher clarity and small group instruction will increase.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom visits by School-based administrators, Academic Coach, and District staff using a walkthrough tool with specific Look-fors as well as Data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Student scores yielded on district assessments will be monitored using correlating percentages of 62% threshold for proficiency for ELA, 59% threshold for proficiency for Math, and 65% threshold for Science. Teachers will make predictions regarding student performance on PM 3 based on student performance data. Then, we will calculate the percentage of students expected to reach proficiency. Teachers will review and revise their predictions based on new student performance data monthly, and we will recalculate the percentage of proficiency for each class and grade. Next steps will be reviewed monthly as well to ensure that proficiency continues to increase as we work to meet our established goals for ELA, Math, and Science.
Coaching cycles will be implemented based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom walkthroughs and student performance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.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 evidence based strategy being implemented is a robust, district wide Multi-tiered system of support and teacher clarity. Teacher clarity will impact student proficiency and teacher skill set by building teacher capacity through their studying and collaborating to understand BEST benchmarks. With increased teacher capacity, teachers will better engage students in their instruction of benchmarks by using a variety of pedagogical practices and being intentional with learning targets and success criteria. In addition, teachers will implement effective Teacher-led data-driven small group instruction. We will monitor these strategies through frequent walkthroughs by school-based Instructional Leaders. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing ultimately providing a positive impact on students' learning and assisting with next steps. Teacher clarity has an effect size of .84 and the implementation of Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge .93 At .84 and .93, it is likely that the impact on students will be significantly greater than average when these strategies are implemented with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher clarity has an effect size of .84 and the implementation of Strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge .93 At .84 and .93, it is likely that the impact on students will be significantly greater than average when these strategies are implemented with fidelity. Effective small Group Instruction has an effect size ranging from .57 - .66 according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in timely manner.

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.

Share the data examined by the SLT that determined the need for implementation of teacher clarity and strategies to provide effective small group instruction with the entire faculty and staff

Person Responsible: Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023

Provide ongoing professional learning on the implementation of Benchmark Resources for ELA, Math, and Science during PLCs and Teacher Duty Days

Person Responsible: RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Conduct Collaborative Team Planning that includes planning for alignment with the standard/benchmark, the lesson, the tasks including what strategies will be used to activate prior knowledge.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Facilitate PLCs focused on responding to students' assessment data. Discuss the fidelity in implementing strategies to Integrate with Prior Knowledge and improving teacher clarity. Develop next steps and ideas for instruction. Determine students who need additional interventions to be successful and review

progress of students previously identified as needing support. Identify students who have mastered grade level benchmarks/standards and need enrichment to reach full potential.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Monitor implementation of differentiated instruction for identified AA and SWD students through ongoing Administrative Walk-throughs & feedback.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Academic coach and Intervention teacher will work with teachers throughout the MTSS process to identify instances where students may need to change tiers or receive additional interventions through the PST process.

Person Responsible: RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Instructional Coach will collaborate with teachers during collaborative planning sessions to use students achievement data from ongoing progress monitoring to create actionable MTSS plans tied to S.M.A.R.T (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely) goals to keep students and teachers on track to increased proficiency.

Person Responsible: Julia Carson (clcarson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Instructional Coach will work with teachers individually and in small groups to increase teacher capacity regarding their implementation of rigorous, benchmark-aligned instruction. Coaching cycles/caseloads will be determined in collaboration with Administration and will be revised as needed.

Person Responsible: Julia Carson (clcarson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#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.

The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. At Forest Lake Elementary School, student behaviors such as physical aggression increased in recent years as indicated by increases in incidents of physical aggression as well as increases in Office Discipline referrals for hitting and striking actions. During SY 2022-2023, both total Office of Discipline referrals and referrals for HS specifically decreased significantly due to the interventions that were implemented last year. For SY 2022- 2023, there was a total of 566 discipline events, 104 or 18 % resulted in Out-of-School suspension. When comparing the discipline data to SY 2021-2022, there was a total of 769 discipline events of which 132 or 17 % resulted in Out-of-School suspensions. This data indicates the Office of Discipline received 203 fewer referrals for the 2022- 2023 school which represents a 26 % reduction in referrals and a 1 % increase in Out-of-School suspensions. In addition, the Office of Discipline received 100 referrals for HS, which was 121 fewer referrals compared to the previous year. However, the total number of referrals for SC increased from 37 to 52. While we are pleased with the decrease in total discipline referrals and referrals for HS, we are concerned that district data shows disproportionate discipline of minority students and students with disabilities as evidenced by the number of referrals and disciplinary consequences. We would like to reduce total referrals further, especially with respect to our AA students and SWDs.

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

During SY 2023-2024, Forest Lake Elementary School will decrease discipline referrals by 10%, and the number of positive referrals will increase by 25%.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored in the Fall, Spring, and End of Year through the implementation of checklists and Benchmark of Quality surveys. Office of Discipline referrals will be monitored both at the district level and school level monthly during PBIS monthly PLC meetings to increase core instruction in behavior for all students and intensify monitoring of disproportionate rates of discipline.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.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 evidence-based strategy being implemented is a multi-disciplinary approach through district-wide MTSS framework. Outcomes will be measured & monitored:
1.) Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored by the district MTSS planning team and by the school based PBIS PLCs on a monthly basis.
2.) Fidelity checklists will be monitored by our Admin TOA, Mr. Connolly, and the PBIS District Coordinator, Dr. Mandy Ellzey, following the close of the reporting windows for fall reporting, spring reporting, and end of year

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is grounded in strategic analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-based Decision Making. Based upon research, the PBIS Implementation Checklist is a quick checklist to assess the degree of implementation for actively implementing schools. It gives teams a sense of what has-been-done and what needs-to-be-done in the PBIS implementation process. The Benchmarks of Quality survey is intended to guide both initial implementation and sustained use of PBIS Tier 1. Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010). These assessments contains 53-items divided into ten critical elements that make up an effective PBIS Tier 1 system. Completion of the BoQ produces scale and subscale scores indicating the extent to which these critical elements are in place.

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.

Continue PBIS practices teachers will use within their classrooms. The PBIS practices include the Panther Pride 200 Club, Panther Buck class goals and incentives, and positive referrals.

Person Responsible: RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Provide professional development on our school-wide PBIS structure which included an overview of the FLE PBIS plan and reviewed expectations for all stakeholders. Staff received the PBIS Year at a Glance Calendar for SY 23-24 and additional resources to display in their classrooms and around campus.

Person Responsible: RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 11, 2024

Monthly PBIS Leadership Team meetings to monitor student discipline and observation data
Monthly MTSS team meetings to monitor student progress
Fall - Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist
Spring - Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist
End of Year - Complete Benchmarks of Quality and tired fidelity inventory

Person Responsible: RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

Conduct classroom visits to provide feedback on calm down corners and interventions to be used to assist and prevent inappropriate behaviors. Utilize our Behavior Specialist and School Counselor during classroom visits to assist with feedback.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sojka (masojka@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

January 10 ERPL on MTSS/PBIS. Deliver PD on discipline referral flowchart, Discuss interventions for behaviors and utilizing MTSS to monitor interventions in place.

Person Responsible: RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

Schedule school-wide assemblies to review and reinforce behavior expectations and rewards systems. These assemblies will be scheduled three times through the year: At the beginning of the year,

immediately following Winter Break, and immediately following Spring Break. Teachers will review PBIS procedures in their classrooms as needed.

Person Responsible: RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

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).

Teachers will complete SAC requests for funding for activities that align with our SIP. All funds requests for SAC monies must be approved by the SAC committee in accordance with District and State guidelines. In addition, FLE may access additional District or Title I dollars to provide opportunities to enhance student achievement such as Tutoring, Saturday School (Boot Camps for Science and Math), and additional hands-on activities to increase student engagement.

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 SY 2023-2024 SIP Plan will be posted on our school web site to ensure all stakeholders can access and view our plan. Hard copies of the SIP plan will also be available in our Media Center. The SIP plan will be reviewed and disseminated at our first SAC and PTO meetings. The areas of focus of our SIP plan will also be reviewed with families in curriculum evenings throughout the year.

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))

We hope to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill our school mission and support the needs of students in several ways. We will host various events throughout the school year and develop a strong PFEP plan to increase parent engagement within the school. This year, we have added a Parent Liaison to support this effort. FLE also plans to continue partnerships within the community to build positive relationships.

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))

At FLE, we will work to strengthen the academic program in our school by improving teacher clarity through collaborative planning, targeted to build teacher capacity and pedagogical knowledge, benchmark/standard aligned instruction through targeted coaching cycles, targeted small groups based on student data. Student achievement data will also drive the criteria for students to attend tutoring and Saturday Bootcamps. Based on contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, we will work to provide professional learning with regard to small groups, standards-aligned instruction and teacher clarity in all subject areas, hands-on science opportunities in all grade levels, and MTSS to support current PBIS and Intervention plans.

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))

Our SIP was developed in accordance with Florida state and Volusia County District guidelines.

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: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No