Forest Lake Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Forest Lake Elementary School

1600 DOYLE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

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

Demographics

Principal: Virginia Freeman A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2020-21: (45%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Volusia 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.

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

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Freeman, Virginia	Principal		Provide feedback protocol to teachers from administration on instruction. Provide and lead with Academic Coaches curriculum, planning, and data review days. Continue to provide times for SLT to meet monthly to monitoring implementation, peer coaching, and feedback on student data. Provide additional standards aligned professional learning. Schedule and lead professional learning on teacher clarity, small group instruction, and AVID strategies. Continue working with PLC rubric, outline the norms and roles of each team member, encouraging collaboration.
Baldoni, Vicky	Instructional Coach		Provide training to teachers on curriculum resources, online and paper based. Coaches will observe teachers implementing instruction and assessment, and provide feed back and provide support on instruction and strategies implemented from our work with Teacher Clarity and AVID Elementary implementation. Teachers will implement lessons at appropriate levels of rigor and use manipulatives and hands on activities where appropriate. Coaches will use on-going progress monitoring data to drive future instruction with a focus on ESSA subgroups (Black/ African American & Students with disabilities),

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
			intervention, enrichment, small/whole groups, and data chats. Coaches will work with Administration to provide PLC time for standards-aligned lesson planning/pacing/identifying focus standards. Coaches will show and help teachers use Standards aligned technology subscriptions (new curriculum resources, iReady Instructional, and other standards aligned district offered programs). Coaches will lead vertical learning walks with the purpose of addressing teacher personal growth.
Diamond, Melissa	Instructional Coach		Provide training to teachers on curriculum resources, online and paper based. Coaches will observe teachers implementing instruction and assessment, and provide feed back and provide support on instruction and strategies implemented from our work with Teacher Clarity and AVID Elementary implementation. Teachers will implement lessons at appropriate levels of rigor and use manipulatives and hands on activities where appropriate. Coaches will use on-going progress monitoring data to drive future instruction with a focus on ESSA subgroups (Black/ African American & Students with disabilities), intervention, enrichment, small/whole groups, and data chats. Coaches will work with Administration to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
			provide PLC time for standards-aligned lesson planning/pacing/identifying focus standards. Coaches will show and help teachers use Standards aligned technology subscriptions (new curriculum resources, iReady Instructional, and other standards aligned district offered programs). Coaches will lead vertical learning walks with the purpose of addressing teacher personal growth.
Anselmo, Kathy	Teacher, K-12		Academic Intervention Teacher will assist with the monitoring and tutoring for lower quartile and ESSA subgroup students.
Miller, Chad	Assistant Principal		Provide feedback protocol to teachers from administration on instruction. Provide and lead with Academic Coaches curriculum, planning, and data review days. Continue to provide times for SLT to meet monthly to monitoring implementation, peer coaching, and feedback on student data. Provide additional standards aligned professional learning. Schedule and lead professional learning on teacher clarity, small group instruction, and AVID strategies. Continue working with PLC rubric, outline the norms and roles of each team member, encouraging collaboration.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
LUEBBERT, RACHEAL	Dean	Continue to provide times for SLT to meet monthly to monitoring implementation, peer coaching, and feedback on student data. Provide additional standards aligned professional learning. Schedule and lead professional learning on Teacher Clarity and Avid strategies. Continue working with PLC rubric, outline the norms and roles of each team member, encouraging collaboration. Coordinate Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, and monitor student discipline data with AP. Lead with Avid team to provide professional learning on new Avid structure, strategies, and cultural shift.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/3/2022, Virginia Freeman A

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
47

Total number of students enrolled at the school
475

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	69	48	86	69	80	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	13	7	14	9	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	5	5	5	15	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	22	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	28	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	10	10	22	10	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	6	11	10	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/3/2022

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	60	55	84	72	78	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	11	13	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	60	55	84	72	78	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	11	13	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%			55%			50%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%			52%			61%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%			53%			55%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	54%			47%			53%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%			38%			61%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%			24%			45%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	60%			47%			55%	57%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	49%	58%	-9%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	59%	-13%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	52	45	26	56	57	17				
ELL	39	59	27	39	56	40	46				
BLK	34	48		29	39		17				
HSP	58	70	33	51	61	53	62				
WHT	63	65	73	60	60	53	71				
FRL	56	65	48	49	54	46	56				

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	64		12	55						
ELL	46	47		42	24		33				
BLK	42			27							
HSP	47	59	60	45	31	18	34				
WHT	60	44		51	36		57				
FRL	51	49	43	43	35	29	46				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	43	46	27	54	48	21				
ELL	32	59	57	49	66	52	40				
BLK	24	22		26	59						
HSP	44	65	57	50	54	46	43				
WHT	56	62	68	56	64	40	59				
FRL	48	58	51	52	63	45	53				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	64
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

When analyzing our school data review, it becomes clear that Forest Lake Elementary has shown consistent growth in six of the seven school grade components. Since 2021 ELA Achievement has grown from 55% to 57%, ELA Learning Gains from 52% to 65%, Math Achievement from 47% to 54%, Math Learning Gains from 38% to 58%, Math Lowest 25th Percentile from 24% to 50%, and Science Achievement from 47% to 60%. The only component that did not show growth was our ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. In terms of our subgroups, all subgroups showed growth except for our African American subgroup which dropped by from 49% to 34%. Additionally, SWD dropped from a 43% to 39%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Looking at our data, we can see that most scores are trending positively showing that we should continue current support and work to target specific subgroups and students to bring all students to proficiency especially our African American subgroup and Students with Disabilities. Our African American student subgroup is currently performing at 34% and our SWD subgroup is currently performing at 39% showing a need for increased differentiation.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factor for our Students with Disabilities includes having two high-needs programs which include EBD and ASD. The scores of these students contribute to a larger drop in scores in comparison to schools without specialized programs. Additionally, last year and traditionally we have had some crossover between subgroups when it comes to our SWD and African American subgroups. Some students may have influenced both subgroups showing a more rapid decline. Within our African American subgroup for the 2021-2022 school year, we had a total of 32 students in grades 3-5. Since this is a lower number of students compared to other demographics in our school, a lower number of students would need to score under proficiency in relation to higher populated subgroups to generate a lower proficiency percentage. To bring all students to proficiency, we will be working on bettering our practices surrounding standard aligned instruction, targeted small group supports for our ESSA subgroups., and MTSS strategies. In the future, we will be ensuring they are the first to be considered for afterschool tutoring programs. Additionally, we will be ensuring they will be partaking in all aspects of our WIN-related practices that include enrichment and remediation.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our highest gains per our FSA scores were within ELA Learning gains which moved from 52% to 65%, Math achievement which moved from 47% to 54%, Math Learning Gains that moved from 38% to 58%, Math Lowest Quartile which moved from 24% to 50%, and Science Achievement which moved from 47% to 60%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

To increase scores in these areas we focused heavily on standard aligned instruction for all subject areas. Targeted small groups were created for specifically for Reading Math using their diagnostic reports and more specifically in math the prerequisite report. These groups were designed in reading to work on gaps that students had in their learning while enriching those that demonstrated proficiency. In math, grade levels used the prerequisite reports, generated from their diagnostic, to sort students based on their prerequisite knowledge of an upcoming topic. Lessons were generated to either enrich or address gaps in each student's learning so that they would better receive whole group instruction which led to a reduction in time spent on remediation. . In science, we focused on hands-on experiments and activities that allowed the students to better connect with the science and connect the curriculum to real-life experiences. Additionally, all grade levels used questions or pictures of the day to better engage students in cumulative review throughout the year.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

To accelerate learning, we will be working to improve teacher clarity through collaborative planning targeted to build teacher capacity and pedagogical knowledge; standard aligned instruction through targeted coaching cycles; targeted small groups by utilizing FAST, iReady, Cambium, and School City data; and finally intervention plans through goal setting and review. Our data shows our school trending in the right direction and our team believes that we need to continue our current support and improve as needed.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, we will work to provide professional learning in regards to a small group with the new Math B.E.S.T standards and curriculum, standard aligned instruction and teacher clarity in all subject areas, hands-on science opportunities in all grade levels, and finally, MTSS to support our current PBIS and intervention plans.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond will include academic coaching within professional learning communities and collaborative planning to implement with fidelity teacher clarity, hands-on science learning, small group instruction and MTSS. Monitoring through customized iReady reports to track our ESSA subgroups, intervention groups, and lowest quartile. Additional monitoring will occur through PLC with Science Topic Checks, the Science SMT, Math Chapter Tests, Math SMT, Reading Unit Assessments, and Phonics Assessments.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal: 1 Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that only 51% of our lowest quartile reached proficiency in ELA and 50% in Math. Additionally, in our analysis, our ESSA subgroups showed that our SWD reached 39% proficiency and BLK reached 34% proficiency. Further analysis showed that most of the students in our lowest quartile are also in one or both of our two targeted ESSA subgroups.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal will be to increase the percentage of our lowest quartile reaching proficiency (70%) from 51% to 56% in ELA and 50% to 55% in Math. We will utilize Unit Assessments in ELA and Chapter Assessments in Math to monitor the progress of our LQ and ESSA subgroups. The teacher will analyze data and create small group instruction to show progress towards a 5% increase for all students with particular focus on students within the lowest quartile, in the students with disabilities subgroup, and finally the black student subgroup from the previous year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through fidelity checks of interventions that were selected to ensure fidelity and integrity (What percentage of our students are increasing from assessment to assessment in response to the intervention?) Two times per month PLC's will engage in data analysis of LQ and ESSA subgroup students to determine the effect of the intervention. Instruction, curriculum, and environment will all be assessed (ICEL) during each PLC. The instrument for data collection will be School City and iReady. iReady will house specific reports regarding grade level lowest quartile and grade level ESSA subgroup reports. Academic coaches and administration will utilize data gained through walkthrough data and the stock take process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	RACHEAL LUEBBERT (reluebbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented	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 collaboration of understanding benchmarks. With increased teacher capacity teachers will better engage students in their instruction of the benchmark by using a variety of pedagogical practices and being intentional with success criteria and learning targets. K-5 will engage in WIN (What I Need) for both reading and math where they will receive tiered support based on their level of diagnostic data. K-2 will utilize Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, SIPPS, and Benchmark Universe based on

for this Area of Focus.	student diagnostic data and continued progress monitoring for tiered support in the area of ELA. For math, teachers will utilize prerequisite reports to determine levels of student knowledge and use Big Idea resources to support tiers within small group instruction. 3-5 will utilize Benchmark Universe, SIPPS plus resources, and iReady Toolbox resources based on student diagnostic data and continued progress monitoring for tier support in the area of ELA. For math, teachers will utilize prerequisite reports to determine levels of student knowledge and use iReady Math Toolbox resources to support tiers within small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Teachers will be trained in MTSS and will utilize a problem-solving model within the framework to improve student outcomes by learning how to select strategies for student improvement using the decision trees. Teachers will further implement these in a small groups with fidelity. By utilizing School City Data and reports that are targeted to grade-level specific lowest quartile and ESSA subgroups, the school can become reflective in whether the targeted MTSS strategies are effective throughout the course of the year.

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.

Academic coaches will work to help teachers disaggregate and understand student diagnostic data and continued progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible	Vicky Baldoni (vpbaldon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaches will work to support teachers in the creation of groups that address the tiered needs of students and to set the S.M.A.R.T (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely) goals tied to ongoing progress monitoring.

Person Responsible	Melissa Diamond (mldiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Intervention teachers and academic coaches will help teachers to identify appropriate resources for the student's specific level of academic growth in their specific tier.

Person Responsible	Kathy Anselmo (kranselm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaches will work to support teachers throughout the MTSS process to identify instances where students may need to change tiers or receive additional interventions through the PST process as a cyclic.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Administration will work to oversee the continuation MTSS and intervention processes throughout the course of the year.

Person Responsible	Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaches will help teachers collaboratively plan for instruction within and outside of the school day to better support MTSS strategies within instruction.

Person Responsible   Melissa Diamond (mldiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaches will engage in coaching cycles related to the success of ESSA subgroups and MTSS.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, we identified the need for continued growth across all three subject areas. In the 2021 school year, Forest Lake had 55% of students proficient in ELA, 47% of students proficient in Math, and 47% of students proficient in Science. As a result of continued standard-aligned instruction and Teacher Clarity last year we grew significantly. Teachers improved teacher clarity by collaboratively planning nad identifying success criteria and learning targets. Academic coaches used this to help build teacher capacity and instructional pratice. In the 2022 school year, Forest Lake had 57% of students proficient in ELA, 54% of students proficient in Math, and 60% proficient in Science. John Hattie states that Teacher Clarity instruction has an effect size 0.75. As we continue to work on Teacher Clarity, we will work to achieve a 5% increase in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal will be to increase the overall percentage of achievement across all three subject areas by 5% so that we have 62% proficiency in ELA, 59% proficiency in Math, and 65% in Science. Teachers will monitor their data on School City to mirror or exceed the school-related goals with special attention to ESSA Subgroups (African American and Students with Disabilities) and Lowest Quartile.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through student proficiency on the state's F.A.S.T assessment. Additionally, we will use iReady to monitor reading and math proficiency for grades 3-5 through three different diagnostic points. In grades K-2, the school will monitor math proficiency through the use of chapter assessments and in reading, unit assessments. K-2 will also use the Benchmark Universe phonics program, Heggerty, VPASS, or SIPPS to monitor student phonemic awareness and phonics. All grade levels will utilize the district's Science Topic Checks, VSTs, and SMT's when prompted to monitor science achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Forest Lake will implement Teacher Clarity which works to make learning visible through the use of the standard, learning targets, and success criteria for every lesson. Teachers will heighten their own pedagogical knowledge by working with these pieces of the curriculum and also work to create alternative pathways for each student to meet the lesson's success criteria through MTSS support.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to John Hattie, Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 on student achievement. Teachers will utilize district provided curriculum maps, learning targets, and success criteria within PLCs to plan for alternative pathways through MTSS for each and every student to meet the success criteria of the lesson.

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.

Academic coaches will collaborate with teachers during collaborative planning to incorporate the discussion of the standard, learning target, and success criteria into lesson planning and lesson delivery.

Person Responsible Vicky Baldoni (vpbaldon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaches will collaborate with teachers during collaborative planning to use student achievement data from ongoing progress monitoring to create actionable MTSS (What I Need) plans tied to S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely goals) set within PLC to keep students and teachers on a track to increased proficiency.

Person Responsible Melissa Diamond (mldiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration will work to oversee the continuation of Teacher Clarity and MTSS supports throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Virginia Freeman (vafreema@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, we identified the need for continued growth across the subjects of reading in math. In the 2021 school year, Forest Lake had 55% of students proficient in ELA and 47% of students proficient in Math. As a result of continued response to intervention and small group instruction last year, we grew significantly. In the 2022 school year, Forest Lake had 57% of students proficient in ELA and 54% of students proficient in Math. John Hattie states that Response to Intervention and Instruction has an effect size of 1.29. As we continue to work on our Response to Intervention, we will work to achieve a 5% increase in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal will be to increase the overall percentage of achievement across both subject areas by 5% so that we have 62% proficiency in ELA and 59% proficiency in Math. Teachers will analyze their data regularly and respond to their school city and FAST data to mirror or exceed the school-related goal.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through student proficiency on the state's F.A.S.T assessment. Additionally, we will use iReady to monitor reading and math proficiency for grades 3-5 over three different diagnostic points. In grades K-2, the school will monitor math proficiency through the use of chapter assessments and within reading, they will use district unit assessments. K-2 will also use the Benchmark Universe phonics program, Heggerty, VPASS, or SIPPS to monitor student phonemic awareness and phonics. Academic coaches and administration will utilize data gained through walkthrough data and the stock take process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vicky Baldoni (vpbaldon@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	In response to our Needs Assessment and Analysis, we will be continuing our Response to Intervention and Instruction.

implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Response to Intervention and Instruction is a tiered strategy that allows teachers to identify and plan for students who are struggling or may struggle with content in their future. Teachers will use both classroom and district-level ongoing progress monitoring to group students within their small group block based on similar needs. Teachers will then use standard aligned instruction through these targeted small groups to meet the student at their level and bring them to grade level or provide enrichment on grade level.

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.

Academic coaches will work with teachers to create small groups based on both classroom and district-level data.

Person Responsible	Melissa Diamond (mldiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaches and intervention teachers will work with teachers to find effective standard-aligned resources for both intervention and enrichment groups.

Person Responsible	Vicky Baldoni (vpbaldon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

The administration will work to oversee the continuation of small groups and response to intervention and instruction supports throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Chad Miller (camiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic Coaches will work to engage teachers in collaborative planning and engage teachers in coaching cycles relating to bettering teacher pratice.

Person Responsible	Melissa Diamond (mldiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

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

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

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

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Forest Lake Elementary plans to build positive relationships with stakeholders to fulfill our school's mission and support the needs of students in several ways. We plan to host Parent Events and develop a strong PFEP plan to increase parent engagement within the school. Forest Lake plans to incorporate Social Emotional Learning (SEL) into the school day through PBIS practices teachers will use within their classrooms. Forest Lake Elementary also plans to continue partnerships with the community to build positive relationships.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

The administration, especially Rachel Luebbert will work to continue and monitor our PBIS practices by continuing structures that include the Panther Pride 200 club, Panther Buck class goal and incentives, as well as EBD"s Tier 3 PBIS supports. Our guidance counselor will work to provide instruction on taking metamoment to regulate emotion using RULER. Teachers will work to carry out our PBIS systems by recognizing individual positive behaviors such as being kind, responsible, collaborative, respectful, and safe. Teachers will also work to provide class-level recognition by giving classes that are following school expectations panther bucks. Jessica Ondina, our bookkeeper, is our Business Partner Coordinator and they are responsible for recruiting local businesses and community organizations to form partnerships with our school. Melissa Diamond works to promote positive relationships by engaging parents and staff in the work of the School Advisory Council. Colleen Murphy acts as our parent-teacher liaison for our Parent Teacher Organization which helps to foster positive relationships and a greater understanding of our school community. These partnerships in turn provide needed support for the school programs and enhance the educational programs at Forest Lake.