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### Demographics

**Principal: Kelly Maldonado** Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2019

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2019-20 Status**(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**(per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
|  | Asian Students |
|  | Black/African American Students |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented** | Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| (subgroups with 10 or more students) | English Language Learners |
| (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Hispanic Students |
|  | Students With Disabilities |
|  | White Students |
| **School Grade** | 2018-19: B |
|  | 2017-18: B |
|  | 2016-17: B |
| **School Grades History** | 2015-16: C |
|  | 2014-15: C |
|  | 2013-14: A |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information\*** |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Diane Leinenbach |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** |  |
| **Year** |  |
| **Support Tier** | NOT IN DA |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| \* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](https://www.floridacims.org/)

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

##  Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement**

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

### Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

**Name 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.

The job duties and responsibilities of Ms. Rivera are to meet

Administrative the needs of the English Language Learners on campus and Support ensure the appropriate documentation is kept and inputted

into our student management system to allow for proper

funding.

Rivera,

Betty

Clemente, Luriela

Assistant Principal

The job duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal are to support the vision of the principal and assist with managing the areas of focus.

The job duties and responsibilities of Mrs. Hartley is to serve

Administrative the teachers as an Instructional Coach. Mrs. Hartley supports Support the action plan of the SIP while supporting classroom

teachers with new initiatives and strategies to improve

student achievement.

Hartley,

Kimberly

Vilabrera, Joslyn

Administrative Support

The job duties and responsibilities of Dr. Vilabrera include MTSS Tier 3 Intervention and support for classroom teachers.

Zagarella, Administrative The job duties and responsibilities for Mrs. Zagarella include Jennifer Support the Curriculum Resource Teacher, Testing Coordinator and

Math Coach to support teachers and classroom instruction.

### Early Warning Systems Current Year

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

**Total**

**6 7 8 9 10 11 12**

**5**

**4**

**K 1 2 3**

**Grade Level**

**Indicator**

Number of students enrolled 88 81 98 137 103 107 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 614

 Attendance below 90 percent 19 14 15 23 19 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 103

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| One or more suspensions 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math 0 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on statewide 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |

assessment

### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

**Grade Level**

**Total**

**K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12**

**Indicator**

Students with two or more indicators 0 1 1 8 7 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 21

### The number of students identified as retainees:

**Indicator**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

48

### Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/21/2019

### Prior Year - As Reported

**Indicator**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 20 | 23 | 22 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

 Level 1 on statewide assessment 0 0 0 48 29 32 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 109

### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

**Grade Level**

**Total**

**K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12**

**Indicator**

Students with two or more indicators 0 2 0 17 7 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 35

### Prior Year - Updated

**Indicator**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 20 | 23 | 22 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

 Level 1 on statewide assessment 0 0 0 48 29 32 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 109

### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

**Grade Level**

**Total**

**K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12**

**Indicator**

Students with two or more indicators 0 2 0 17 7 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 35

##  Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

|  |
| --- |
| **School Data**Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools). |
| **School Grade Component** | **2019** | **2018** |
| **School** | **District** | **State** | **School** | **District** | **State** |
| ELA Achievement | 48% | 57% | 57% | 52% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58% | 58% | 58% | 60% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 59% | 52% | 53% | 57% | 48% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | 63% | 63% | 66% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 52% | 61% | 62% | 51% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 48% | 51% | 49% | 46% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 60% | 56% | 53% | 54% | 55% | 55% |

|  |
| --- |
| **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey** |
| **Indicator** | **Grade Level (prior year reported)** | **Total** |
| **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Number of students enrolled | 88 (0) | 81 (0) | 98 (0) | 137 (0) | 103 (0) | 107 (0) | 614 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 19 (0) | 14 (20) | 15 (23) | 23 (22) | 19 (20) | 13 (11) | 103 (96) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 2 (3) | 1 (0) | 3 (5) | 1 (0) | 3 (2) | 10 (10) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 5 (6) | 2 (0) | 10 (2) | 2 (3) | 3 (1) | 22 (12) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 30 (48) | 26 (29) | 25 (32) | 81 (109) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Grade Level Data**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.NOTE: 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** |
| 03 | 2019 | 36% | 55% | -19% | 58% | -22% |
|  | 2018 | 40% | 55% | -15% | 57% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -4% |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |
| 04 | 2019 | 46% | 57% | -11% | 58% | -12% |
|  | 2018 | 54% | 54% | 0% | 56% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -8% |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **ELA** |
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School- District****Comparison** | **State** | **School- State****Comparison** |
| Cohort Comparison | 6% |  |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 54% | -4% | 56% | -6% |
|  | 2018 | 46% | 55% | -9% | 55% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | 4% |  |
| Cohort Comparison | -4% |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **MATH** |
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School- District****Comparison** | **State** | **School- State****Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 41% | 62% | -21% | 62% | -21% |
|  | 2018 | 59% | 61% | -2% | 62% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -18% |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |
| 04 | 2019 | 51% | 63% | -12% | 64% | -13% |
|  | 2018 | 62% | 62% | 0% | 62% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -11% |  |
| Cohort Comparison | -8% |  |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 57% | -7% | 60% | -10% |
|  | 2018 | 54% | 59% | -5% | 61% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -4% |  |
| Cohort Comparison | -12% |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **SCIENCE** |
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School- District****Comparison** | **State** | **School- State****Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | 54% | 54% | 0% | 53% | 1% |
|  | 2018 | 47% | 53% | -6% | 55% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | 7% |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Subgroup Data** |
| **2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** |
| **Subgroups** | **ELA****Ach.** | **ELA LG** | **ELA LG****L25%** | **Math Ach.** | **Math LG** | **Math LG****L25%** | **Sci Ach.** | **SS****Ach.** | **MS****Accel.** | **Grad Rate****2016-17** | **C & C Accel****2016-17** |
| SWD | 30 | 57 | 57 | 32 | 32 | 54 | 33 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 39 | 60 | 60 | 48 | 49 | 59 | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| ASN | 64 |  |  | 73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 52 | 61 |  | 52 | 63 |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 47 | 59 | 61 | 53 | 50 | 51 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 44 | 50 |  | 44 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 43 | 57 | 58 | 49 | 48 | 49 | 52 |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** |
| **Subgroups** | **ELA****Ach.** | **ELA LG** | **ELA LG****L25%** | **Math Ach.** | **Math LG** | **Math LG****L25%** | **Sci Ach.** | **SS****Ach.** | **MS****Accel.** | **Grad Rate****2015-16** | **C & C Accel****2015-16** |
| SWD | 26 | 56 | 47 | 41 | 42 | 31 | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 41 | 60 | 59 | 54 | 44 | 54 | 21 |  |  |  |  |
| ASN | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 52 | 64 |  | 74 | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 50 | 58 | 59 | 63 | 47 | 46 | 53 |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 60 |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 51 | 59 | 56 | 65 | 50 | 48 | 52 |  |  |  |  |

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

|  |
| --- |
| **ESSA Federal Index** |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 72 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 454 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| **Subgroup Data** |
| **Students With Disabilities** |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 56 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Asian Students** |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 69 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Black/African American Students** |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 54 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** |
| Federal Index - Native American Students |  |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Pacific Islander Students** |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students |  |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **White Students** |
| Federal Index - White Students | 42 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 53 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

### Analysis

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 data component that showed the lowest performance was math proficiency. Overall, the students' proficiency dropped from 66% in 2018 to 53% in 2019, a drop of 13%. The contributing factors noted a significant lack of number sense skills in the students moving from second to third grade. The trend was seen throughout the entire school year and initiatives to mitigate were unsuccessful with the current third grade students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline form the previous year was math proficiency. The students who moved into third grade during the 2018-2019 school year were significantly lower in number sense skills and attributed to the drop from 66% to 53% (-13%) in math proficiency.

**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**

The data component with the greatest gap between the school and state is ELA proficiency with a difference of 9% (57% for the State compared to 48% for our school). The population of Forsyth Woods Elementary School is predominately Hispanic ELL students, which impacts the overall proficiency in ELA. The constraints indicate that language acquisition and vocabulary contributed to the 9% gap. Although the school subgroups performed well and met the ESSA requirements, ELA is still an area of growth for the school.

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

The data component that showed the greatest gains was Science proficiency with an increase from 54% in 2018 to 60% in 2019 (+ 6%). The fifth grade team and an instructional coach worked side by side all year to disaggregate Performance Measurement Assessment (PMA) data and adjusted instruction accordingly. In addition, students were invited to a Science and Math Club where they were able to practice the standards and reinforce concepts throughout the year.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Based on EWS data attendance below 90% (103 students) and level one on state assessments (81 students) are the two main areas of concern. Of the 103 students with attendance concerns 55 are in tested grade levels and has a direct correlation to performance on statewide assessments.

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

* 1. Increase math proficiency
	2. Increase math learning gains for all
	3. Increase reading proficiency
	4. Increase reading learning gains for all
	5. Decrease attendance below 90%

##  Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

Narrow the achievement gap in overall math proficiency from 53% to 65%.

Math proficiency dropped during the 18/19 school year from 66% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. Learning gains in math showed growth, but more attention is needed to ensure this is maintained throughout the next school year and to increase overall math proficiency scores.

**Title**

**Rationale**

**#1**

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

**Evidence- based Strategy**

**Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy**

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is an increase in math proficiency scores from 53% to 65% (increase of 12%) as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in Math.

Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net)

Teachers will use iReady math profile data and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small group intervention to support the math standards. The lowest performing math students in 3rd to 5th grade will be given additional support-utilizing culturally responsive instruction, such as communication of high expectations to all students and special attention given to student-centered instruction. Text Dependent Questions (TDQs) and Academic Discourse will be part of the strategies used with all students. In addition, an acceleration approach to math will be used in the intervention block to allow students to be exposed to the standards prior to the actual instruction in the standard therefore increasing the time the students see the topic/content. Our ATS program will be tailored and will consist of a combination of acceleration strategies and intervention in Math.

The rationale behind utilizing iReady profile and instructional grouping reports is to allow the teachers to create fluid groups of intervention based on actual student data and needs.

 Action Step

* + 1. Teachers will use iReady math profile and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small intervention groups.
		2. Teachers will administer iReady math diagnostic three times per year, standards mastery, and growth monitoring two times per year to utilize data and adjust small intervention groups.
		3. Administration and members of the leadership team will monitor data and small intervention group data and make adjustments to instruction and

### Description

grouping as needed.

* + 1. A Minority Achievement Office (MAO) acceleration approach will be used in second grade to allow students to be exposed to topics/content prior to actual teaching of the standards allowing the students additional time on each subject strand.
		2. After-school Tutoring will include targeted groups reinforcing concepts already presented in the classroom.
		3. Last year's achievement data will be used to identify areas of growth and tailor Professional Development to increase teachers' effectiveness.

### Person Responsible

Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

Narrow the achievement gap in math learning gains from 52% to 60%.

Math learning gains during the 18/19 school year improved from 51% to 52%, an increase of 1%. The focus on student' learning gains will also impact impact and improve overall proficiency.

**Title**

**Rationale**

**#2**

### State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

**Evidence- based Strategy**

**Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy**

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is an increase of at least 8% in learning gains--from 52% to 60% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in Math.

Luriela Clemente (luriela.clemente@ocps.net)

Teachers will use a rotation and walk-to intervention for Math during FBS. In addition, after-school tutoring will offer a focus on Math acceleration and reinforcement of concepts. Our instructional coaches will also be used to pull- out previously identified students. Additional support will be given to all students utilizing Culturally Responsive Instruction (communication of high- expectations, individualized and differentiated instruction taking into consideration native language and cultural preferences when it comes to Math), Text Dependent Questions (TDQs), and Academic Discourse.

The rationale for selecting this strategy will allow the leadership team and grade level math teams to analyze FSA data and i-Ready student profiles and determine action plans to fit the needs of the individual students.

 Action Step

* + - 1. Compare i-Ready EOY and FSA Math data to identify the students with the most needs.
			2. Determine resources for intervention and tutoring.
			3. Brief classroom teachers and receive input to create intervention and tutoring groups.
			4. Establish start date for tutoring and MAO intervention.

### Description

**Person Responsible**

* + - 1. Monitor iReady math diagnostic, standards mastery, and growth monitoring data to adjust intervention groups as needed.
			2. Instructional Coaches participation in grade level PLCs to monitor Math rigorous instruction and standard based instruction.
			3. Coaching Cycles for new teachers and teachers who have been identified as needing support based on observations conducted by administration and coaches.

Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

Increase reading proficiency: Teachers will continue using iReady diagnostic and historical data to focus intervention instruction to meet specific student needs. Intervention will take the walk-to model and will implement fluid student placements. Accelerated Reader (AR) program will encourage student independent reading by setting student and class goals each quin with the use of an incentive program tied to the points and percentage earned.

Decrease the number of students whose attendance falls below 90%: With a new guidance counselor and behavior specialist, we will implement attendance incentives and pr oactive monitoring of specific students.

##  Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No.

114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

### Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Forsyth Woods Elementary will coordinate and integrate parent, families, and other community stakeholders by promoting engagement programs and activities through a host of planned events throughout the school year. These activities include, but are not limited to: Literacy, Science, and Math Nights/Workshops, Multicultural Celebration, Parents ESOL classes, and more. Our school will also use social media to communicate important information and events to our parents, families, and community stakeholders in an effort to encourage participation.

### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

### Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Incoming students are provided an orientation with their assigned teachers prior to school starting in order to familiarize students and families with the school, the academic and behavioral expectations as well as the procedures.

The guidance counselor schedules classes in each grade level where she addresses identified social-emotional needs. Teachers refer students with specific needs and the counselor visits and supports these students daily. Our behavior specialist works in tandem with the classroom teachers giving them strategies to address the needs of their students in the classroom. She also conducts socio-emotional groups to give students strategies they can use when they feel overwhelmed, frustrated, etc. During our Threat Assessment meetings the Leadership Team identifies students in need of mentoring and these students are seen at least once daily.

### Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Students are given initial assessments at the beginning of the year. The data from these assessments is analyzed and students' needs are determined regarding performance on the Florida Standards in the intermediate grades and the five areas of reading in the primary grades (Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, Comprehension, Vocabulary, Fluency). Once student needs are determined, interventions are planned for students and are provided on a daily basis. Teachers meet regularly with the leadership team to review progress monitoring data as described below.

Title 1 funds will be used to provide additional staff and materials/training to support our most at-risk students. The funds will also be used to provide opportunities for our teachers to engage in small group or individually administered assessments. These assessments will provide more reliable and targeted data on our students that will direct interventions and additional instruction. Finally, these funds will be used to provide after school learning opportunities for our most at-risk students. These opportunities will allow teachers to work together in Professional Learning Communities as they analyze standards and create learning tasks that align to the expected rigor of the standard.

District Title III funds were provided to purchase an additional bilingual paraprofessional to support our ELL students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction funds were used to provide an instructional position to work with our most struggling readers individually and in small groups. This instruction is in addition to the core instruction they receive in the classroom.

Forsyth Woods participates in Universal Breakfast and Lunch programs, where all students are provided breakfast and lunch free of charge. The counselor works with middle school counselors to schedule the 5th graders' visits at the end of the year, as well as are invited to our school to speak to the students and parents.

### Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Once the FSA scores are analyzed and the areas of improvement are identified, the Leadership Team meets to discuss strategies and programs to implement the upcoming year. The Principal discusses budget and resources to determine an action plan. Monitoring systems, such as spreadsheets to track Culminating Activities at the end of each CRM are implemented to respond quickly to formative and summative assessments adjusting instruction to the students' needs. Instructional Coaches and MTSS Coach meet weekly with grade level PLCs for ELA and Math. Administrators monitor teachers and give actionable feedback as needed. The Media Specialist and the IT Coordinator maintain and report on the status of inventory of resources. Every effort is made to ensure that resources and funds are used in a fiscally responsible manner.

### Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

We use select AVID strategies and participate in college awareness activities such as college spirit days, college banners displayed throughout the campus, etc. We also will implement Project Lead the Way in some of our primary classrooms.

Forsyth Woods Elementary has a partnership with A Gift for Music that provides our students with access to quality music classes that allow our students to learn to play different instruments.

##  Part V: Budget

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Narrow the achievement gap in overall math proficiency from 53% to 65%.** | **$1,800.00** |
|  | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
|  | 3376 | 100-Salaries | 1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary | General Fund |  | $1,800.00 |
|  | *Notes: Additional teacher planning time to build small intervention groups after iReady PD and BOY diagnostics.* |
| **2** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Narrow the achievement gap in math learning gains from 52% to 60%.** | **$84,000.00** |
|  | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
|  | 1141 | 100-Salaries | 1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary | Title, I Part A |  | $84,000.00 |
|  | *Notes: In order to improve math learning gains and proficiency and intense focus will be placed on math in after school tutoring. As a result, additional funds have been allocated and encumbered to support this initiative throughout the school year.* |
| **Total:** | **$85,800.00** |