

Orange County Public Schools

Forsyth Woods Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Forsyth Woods Elementary

6651 CURTIS ST, Orlando, FL 32807

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Maldonado

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2018

2019-20 Status (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%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	
* 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	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.
Rivera, Betty	Administrative Support	The job duties and responsibilities of Ms. Rivera are to meet the needs of the English Language Learners on campus and ensure the appropriate documentation is kept and inputted into our student management system to allow for proper funding.
Hartley, Kimberly	Administrative Support	The job duties and responsibilities of Mrs. Hartley is to serve the teachers as an Instructional Coach. Mrs. Hartley supports the action plan of the SIP while supporting classroom teachers with new initiatives and strategies to improve student achievement.
Vilabrera, Joslyn	Administrative Support	The job duties and responsibilities of Dr. Vilabrera include MTSS Tier 3 Intervention and support for classroom teachers.
Zagarella, Jennifer	Administrative Support	The job duties and responsibilities for Mrs. Zagarella include the Curriculum Resource Teacher, Testing Coordinator and Math Coach to support teachers and classroom instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/24/2018, Kelly Maldonado

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Demographic Data

2020-21 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%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/15/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	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 assessment	0	0	0	30	26	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	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 assessment	0	0	0	30	26	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	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%				
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				

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
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

Math proficiency showed the lowest data component. Overall, the students' proficiency dropped from 66% in 2018 to 53% in 2019, a drop of 13%. The contributing factors

include a significant lack of number sense skills in the students who were now in third grade during the school year 2019-2020. The trend was seen throughout the entire school year 2018-2019 and the initiatives to mitigate were unsuccessful with these third grade students. The trend has continued with this cohort of students who will be in fifth grade during the 2020-2021 school year.

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 from 2018 to 2019 was math proficiency. The third grade students in the 2018-2019 school year were significantly lower in number sense skills and contributed to the drop from 66% to 53% (-13%) in math proficiency. Conversely, these students are now in fifth grade during the 2020-2021 school year. Math continues to be an area of improvement for this cohort of students. Learning gains will be critical for this cohort as a majority of school grade will be earned as a result of these students. In addition, there are concerns about the lost instructional time due to school closures during the COVID 19 pandemic, although multiple efforts to mitigate slide were implemented.

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 the school). The population for Forsyth Woods Elementary School is predominantly Hispanic and/or 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. In addition, there are concerns about the lost instructional time due to school closures during the COVID 19 pandemic, although multiple attempts to mitigate slide were attempted.

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. This practice continued during the 2019-2020 school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on EWS data attendance below 90% (85 students) was a major area of concern. Of the 85 students with attendance concerns 46 students (54%) 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:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math proficiency dropped during the 2018/2019 school year from 66% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. Learning gains in math showed growth, but more attention is needed to ensure learning gains are maintained throughout the next school year and to increase overall math proficiency scores.

Measureable Outcome: 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Zagarella (jennifer.zagarella@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use iReady math profile data and instructional grouping reports to build standards based small group intervention 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. Focus will be applied to Text Dependent Questions (TDQs) and Academic Discourse as part of the strategies used with all students. A combination of technology and Project Based Learning (PBL) will facilitate the meaningful application of knowledge with well thought out projects thus applying their newly acquired knowledge. An acceleration approach to math is used in the intervention block to allow students to be exposed to the standards prior to the actual standard being taught therefore increasing the time the students see the topic/content.

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

Action Steps to Implement

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 grouping as needed.
4. 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.
5. After-school Tutoring will include targeted groups reinforcing concepts already presented in the classroom.
6. Project Based Learning (PBL) and one-on-one technology will be used to tailor instruction to the students' specific needs.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math learning gains during the 2018/2019 school year improved from 51% to 52%, an increase of 1%. The focus on student' learning gains will also impact and improve overall proficiency.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students at or above grade level in reading will receive Math Intervention during th standard FBS time. 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.

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

Action Steps to Implement

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.
5. Monitor iReady math diagnostic, standards mastery, and growth monitoring data to adjust intervention groups as needed.
6. Instructional Coaches will participate in PLC's to ensure standards based instruction conversations and planning are taking place and assist where needed.
7. Coaching Cycles for new teachers and teachers who have been identified as needing support based on observations conducted by administration and coaches.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at Forsyth Woods Elementary School with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject matter material. By ensuring that Forsyth Woods Elementary School has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: decrease students with lower than 90% attendance rates and foster an environment of acceptance and learning.

Measureable Outcome:

- Improvement in EWS Attendance data
- Panorama survey data
- Cognia survey data
- Anticipated impact of a culture and climate of student achievement

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Maldonado (kelly.maldonado@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Forsyth Woods Elementary School will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. A plan of action will be modified based on data, student needs and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model Forsyth Woods Elementary School can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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 quarter 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 the help of a school counselor and behavior specialist we will implement attendance incentives and proactive monitoring of identified students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to develop establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in on-going, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$1,800.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
3376	100-Salaries	1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary	General Fund		\$1,800.00	
		<i>Notes: Notes: Additional teacher planning time to build small intervention groups after iReady PD and BOY diagnostics.</i>				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$75,000.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
1141	100-Salaries	1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$75,000.00	
		<i>Notes: 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.</i>				
		1971 - Forsyth Woods Elementary			\$0.00	
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
Total:					\$76,800.00	