The School District of Palm Beach County

Forest Hill Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 18

Positive Culture & Environment 24

Budget to Support Goals 25

Forest Hill Elementary School

5555 PURDY LN, West Palm Beach, FL 33415

https://fhes.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Scott Mcnichols

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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 was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/21/2020.

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 12

Planning for Improvement 18

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 25

Forest Hill Elementary School

5555 PURDY LN, West Palm Beach, FL 33415

https://fhes.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/21/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Forest Hill Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Forest Hill Elementary envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

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
McNichols, Scott	Principal	Scott is the instructional leader for the school and overseeing the day to day operations. He is responsible for overseeing all systems at Forest Hill Elementary and ensuring it's effectiveness. He is responsible for the safety of everyone at Forest Hill Elementary.
Higgins, Sean	Assistant Principal	Sean is responsible for the day to day operations in Mr. McNichols absence. He is responsible for the School Wide Positive Behavior cultural within Forest Hill Elementary. He is also responsible for monitoring the curriculum of K-2 teachers.
Edwards, Lora	Other	ESOL Lora is responsible for keeping open communication with parents in our Dual Language program. She is responsible for all our ELL students placements and needs within the classroom. Lora coordinates our CLF and ESOL teacher schedules and overseas their instruction.
Starr, Duane	Teacher, ESE	ESE Contact: Duane is responsible for overseeing the ESE department. He maintains open communication with our ESE parents and schedules our ESE meetings.
Bisono, Edy	Instructional Coach	ESOL Teacher: Edy is responsible for overseeing the ELA academics in grade 4 and 5. She is responsible for developing the scope and sequence in these grade levels and making instructional based decisions based upon assessment data.
DelCollado, Aida	Instructional Coach	Dual Language Coach: Aida is responsible for overseeing the SLA academics in grade K-3. She is responsible for developing the scope and sequence in these grade levels and making instructional based decisions based upon assessment data.
Prieto, Courtney	Other	SBT Lead/Reading Intervention Teacher: Courtney is responsible for monitoring, leading and implementing School Based Team at Forest Hill Elementary. She is also responsible for coaching Kindergarten through 3rd Grade teachers in ELA ESP contact
Quezada, Joanne	Instructional Coach	ESOL Teacher: Joanne is responsible for overseeing the Mathematics academics in grade K-5. She is responsible for developing the scope and sequence in these grade levels and making instructional based decisions based upon assessment data. She also works with LY and LF students in math.
Wise, Susan	Instructional Coach	Susan is responsible for overseeing the Science academics in grade K-5. She is responsible for developing the scope and sequence in these grade levels and making instructional based decisions based upon assessment

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		data. She works directly with 5th grade students. Susan is responsible for overseeing the ELA academics in grade 1. She is responsible for developing the scope and sequence in this grade level and making instructional based decisions based upon assessment data.
Siedman, Joy	Other	ESOL Teacher: Joy is responsible for our AVID implementation as our AVID coordinator. She is responsible for ensuring that our schools culture is following AVID strategies and implementation. She also works directly with ESOL students in K ELA (LY and LF).
Rock, Leah	Other	SSCC: Leah is responsible for ensuring the overall culture and climate at Forest Hill Elementary. She is responsible for reviewing data to make instructional decisions for K-5 teachers based upon the trends identified through the data. Leah also assists in the implementation of PLCs

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Scott Mcnichols

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.*

8

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.*

24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%

2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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.	

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	108	122	120	131	137	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	753
Attendance below 90 percent	0	26	15	24	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	53	47	68	80	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334
Course failure in Math	0	50	28	46	72	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
FY20 ELA Winter Diag. Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
FY20 Math Winter Diag. Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	46	28	42	58	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	129	115	136	149	140	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	823
Attendance below 90 percent	21	28	20	24	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	67	72	90	80	89	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	53	57	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157

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	14	19	16	61	62	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	129	115	136	149	140	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	823
Attendance below 90 percent	21	28	20	24	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	67	72	90	80	89	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	53	57	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157

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	14	19	16	61	62	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	54%	58%	57%	46%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	63%	58%	58%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	56%	53%	52%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	68%	63%	57%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	68%	62%	67%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	59%	51%	58%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	51%	53%	48%	51%	51%

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	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	62%	-14%	58%	-10%
	2018	50%	58%	-8%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	50%	59%	-9%	56%	-6%
	2018	53%	59%	-6%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	54%	65%	-11%	62%	-8%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	67%	-14%	64%	-11%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	68%	65%	3%	60%	8%
	2018	63%	66%	-3%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	48%	51%	-3%	53%	-5%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	38	46	42	52	46	18				
ELL	48	57	60	60	65	72	50				
ASN	50			58							
BLK	46	58	53	59	70	57	48				
HSP	55	60	60	64	63	62	53				
WHT	71	46		71	54		67				
FRL	54	59	58	64	64	57	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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	39	63	48	42	65	58	65				
ELL	37	57	61	53	65	47	61				
ASN	69	64		69	82						
BLK	47	62	61	54	60	37	62				
HSP	53	63	67	63	72	52	70				
WHT	66	78		69	74		73				
FRL	53	64	65	61	70	51	69				

2017 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	17	39	36	36	62	50	29				
ELL	29	46	48	40	58	57	34				
ASN	55			73							
BLK	33	56	62	52	69	69	29				
HSP	47	56	44	55	65	53	55				
MUL	45	80		73	60						
WHT	64	60		69	80						
FRL	45	59	53	55	67	59	47				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	54
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	59
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

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	62
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	57
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.

When looking at the subgroup data in FY19 across the board our SWD showed a drop in the ELA component with 25 points. The contributing factors where the focus was not as intentional was with our SWD.

In FY 20 we see, High Frequency Words was our lowest performing achievement area in grades 3-5. In grades 3 and 4 the phonics subset assessment in Ready showed a 1% decrease in 3rd grade and 6% decrease in 4th grade. Also historical data from, prior years reported categories RI & RL 1.1 in grades 3-5 had a downward spiral This is revealed to a need for more focused and guided instruction allowing our students more opportunities for accountable talk and building on prior knowledge from previous years instruction.

In grades K-2, only 19% of Kindergarteners, 17% of First Graders, and 7% of Second Graders are showing static growth from Fall to Winter iReady Reading Diagnostics. Within these assessments Phonics was identified and the area of need.

In our 5th grade dual language beginning speaker cluster class, only 52% of our students showed mastery on the Science winter diagnostic. When looking at unit assessments, nature of science is an area for improvement for the grade level as a whole. Our fifth graders scored 4 points below the district average in the nature of science USA.

Learning Gains and OA standards in math continues to be our focus to increase our percentage by 8% when it was at it's highest in 2018.

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

Static growth from Fall to Winter in grades K-2 only 43% showed growth. Phonics was the weakest area exhibiting an 18% decrease from FY 18-19 to current year in first grade and a 9% decrease in 2nd grade.

The winter diagnostic in comparison to the previous year showed a slight decline with our ELL classes. This is due to limited instructional content expertise.

The data that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was the Math Learning Gains. The factor contributing to this is our instructional faculty fully understanding the needs of our students.

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.

Our ELA achievement has the greatest gap where we need to increase our percentage by 3% to be on target with our Strategic plan. This was attributed to a lack of direct phonics instruction in primary. Achievement (54) and the state average (57) is 3 percentage points. We provided our students with whole group phonics instruction through Fundations material, but we need to be more diligent about identifying their specific phonetic needs so that we can address them. However, when looking at our diagnostic data for FY20 midyear Diagnostic third grade increased by 6%, fourth grade by 6% and fifth grade by 7% in growth achievement.

According to our FY20 iReady data our proficiency levels were 45% in third grade, 46% in fourth grade and
49% in fifth grade.

Within our ELA achievement gap our students with disabilities showed the lowest percentage of achievement, at 28% . In order to ensure they continue to grow within ELA achievement, we have made instructional shifts and have encompassed our school based team data records with which students academic needs are identified to drive our instruction. We have also addressed our core instruction to ensure that our students are receiving the instruction in whole group and closing gaps based on data within our small groups.

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

In reading, our lowest 25% had an increase of 5% and our math lowest 25% had an increase of 6%. This was attributed to a special focus on L25% students both during core instruction and throughout small group rotations with support personnel.

When comparing our ELA Diagnostic data from FY19 to FY20 our L25 increase by 50% in gains.

These gains were attributed to the master schedule we ensured that every classroom had a support resource teacher in their room during the reading and mathematics small group. After teaching the on grade level standards, our teachers broke the students into small groups based upon their needs and further explained the standards through differentiated small groups, depending on their students' needs. They determined this by dissecting our assessment data and deliberately targeting instruction. Our resource teachers retaught standards using a secondary focus calendar that was built based on the needs of our students according to their data as outlined in the students FSQ, iReady Diagnostics, and district Diagnostics.
We held a PLC focused on identifying our lowest 25 and determining how they can be taught to make the learning gains and close the gaps. Through identification of these students we were able to begin

closing several gaps.
We also looked at the data through our School Based Team meetings and identified interventions with students that fell into the L25 category.

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

One area of concern is the course failure in ELA and Math based on our ESSA data. Since our grading system us standards-based students receive ND indicating they are not on mastery. Due to this achievement gaps are caused with the state grade level assessments. Course failures cause our students to fall behind and not be on track to meet grade level expectations. In order to ensure courses passed in ELA and Math we've added resource teachers in every classroom to work with our students and begin to close the gaps based on the data trends found in our assessments from Diagnostics, iReady Diagnostics, FSQs and USAs.
During our PLCs we will be dissecting the needs of our students in both Reading and Math and use the data to drive our instruction. Then we will build our focus calendars and small groups around the needs of our students to determine how to close the gaps. Our resource teachers use the secondary calendar to reteach any standards that our students were not mastering. We will identify our students with disabilities specific needs as identified through the data to ensure we are focusing our instruction around their needs.

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

Our first priority is success with LTO #1: 62% of 3rd grade students on or above grade level as measured by FSA. We plan to reach this goal through the collaboration of our classroom teacher and our push in resource teachers, during the reading block. In PLC we will dissect the data and identify the specific needs of our students through small group reteaching. We will provide tutoring to our students this year, after school.

Our second priority is gaining an overall 5% increase in ELA achievement level. In order to contribute to this increase, we have trained our K-2 teachers in Fundations and we are setting up training for any teachers not trained in Double Dose Fundations. This will allow us to provide our students with time to master phonics and phonological awareness.

Our third priority is SWD achievement in gains and L25% gains. In order to focus on this we have identified our SWD and made instructional shifts to ensure they are receiving focused instruction based on their needs as outlined through our data from assessments in the Diagnostics, iReady Diagnostics, FSQs and USAs. This targeted instruction has allowed us to dive deeper into their specific needs to ensure that they are growing in the areas that have previously been identified as having gaps.

4. SWD achievement in Science proficiency
Students are using science review questions daily as well as receiving science instruction through fine arts in both 4th and 5th grade. This has allowed them to receive remediation in science standards that have been identified as having gaps.

5. Implementation of AVID in year two
In AVID, students will be increasing their inquiry and accountable talk in whole group and small group instruction. This will allow their reading and math standards that have been areas of weakness to increase through both written and verbal comprehension.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School ESSA data reflects a deficiency in SWD ELA achievement from FY19, with only a 28% overall proficiency rate for Students with disabilities, this was our lowest performing subgroup in FY19. When compared to FY18 that is a decrease of 11%. In addition the learning gains for our SWD was at 38%, this also decrease (-25%) from the previous year. Our Learning Gains also reflected a decrease of (-2%) with a score of 25% in ELA achievement. In mathematics our SWD Math achievement reflected the same as the previous year at 42%. Our learning gains were at 52% a decrease of -13% from the previous year. The lowest 25% scored at 46% which was a decrease of -12%. During our Mid year Diagnostic data we demonstrated an increase in both ELA and Mathematics. The greatest increase for our SWD was in 3rd grade as they were predicted at 100%. In fourth and fifth grade were predicted at 65%. This demonstrates that our strategic plan was effective with identifying our lowest 25 and identifying their needs to drive our instruction to meet their needs and close their gaps. Our plan shows that we were are on the correct path to meet our goals. Do to lack of data for FY 20 because of state mandated school closures (COVID-19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue with our FY 20 goals for FY 21, however our Diagnostic and iReady data shows our students are making improvements
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable goals based off our Mid-year Diagnostic for FY 20 will be to increase ELA achievement by 57% in third, 62% in fourth grade and 66% in fifth grade. We will continue to maintain our data at 100% learning gains for math and reading in 3rd grade, and 70% in 4th and 5th grade. Our lowest 25% gain goals in math and reading will continue with 100% learning gains in 3rd grade, and 65% in both 4th and 5th grade. Our Science measurable goal for achievement is to increase 22% overall for SWD. Due to the lack of data for FY20 because of state mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments, we will continue with our FY20 goals for FY21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott McNichols (scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Implement differentiated small group instruction through a balance of guided reading/skill grouping with scaffolding of on grade level text. 2. Implement school tutorial programs to support standards-based instruction for remediation, enrichment and support of data selected students to close the achievement gaps. 3. Utilize instructional staff for interventions to support teachers with implementation of the curriculum that focuses on students needs to close gaps to reach mastery of on grade level standards 4. Students will engage in adaptive technology to offer personalized learning solution that provide/ support/ reteach/enrich at their level using iReady, iStation, Successmaker. 5. Continue establishing Professional Learning Communities cycles within all grade levels focusing on data to drive instruction and the "how" of instruction to meet the needs of our students. This support will ensure they are focused on best practices that support equitable and equal access to learning for all students all the time.
Rationale for Evidence-	1. Implementation of a balance of guided reading/skill grouping with scaffolding of on grade level text will provide personalized instruction and learning opportunities for students 2. Tutorial programs will provide students with the additional supports for remediation and enrichment as needed. This will ensure students are receiving additional support for

based Strategy:	success. 3. Remediation/intervention supports will support the students on their individual needs to assist in closing the gaps that are preventing them from reaching mastery of the standards 4. iReady, iStation and Successmaker will offer students opportunities to receive enrichment and remediation on a variety of skills. 5. Professional Learning Communities engage teachers to analyze data in order to make instructional decisions for their students based on their individual learning needs resulting in increased scores.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement a balance of guided reading/skill grouping with scaffolding of on grade level text.
a- Assess students to determine areas of needs and strengths. (FLCKERS, DIBELS, Heggrety, iReady)
b- Analyze data to group students with commonailites and by ability.
c- Teachers will plan instruction to support students using best practices.
d- Teachers will be provided professional development in scaffolding on grade level text for students with various needs.
e- Teachers will monitor progress utilizing benchmark and make adjustments to groupings and instruction.
f- Monitoring will occur through review of the Student Detail Data Base. (AP, SSCC, SBT Leader)

Person Responsible Scott McNichols (scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org)

2. Tutorial programs
a- assist in remediation in reading, writing and math
b- review iReady, iStation and Successmaker data to determine standards that need to be address during tutorial
c- Use data to formalize tutorial groups
d- Students will be grouped according to their needs and teachers will instruct based upon these needs.

Person Responsible Leah Rock (leah.rock@palmbeachschools.org)

3. Remediation/intervention supports
a. Weekly grade level meetings held to review data and determine student progress using a decision tree document that identifies if a student needs interventions.
b. Once identified students are place in a similar group based upon their need with an interventionist trained in that specific area of need
c. Students are provided 8 weeks to show progress from the start date of when they are identified
d. Student progress is reviewed to determine if further interventions are needed or if they can return to core.
e. Intervention/resource teachers push-in or pull out daily and instruct students on their identified specific need.

Person Responsible Courtney Prieto (c.prieto@palmbeachschools.org)

Technology, iStation, iReady
a. Teachers and coaches are monitoring weekly progress, usage/ pass rate.
b. Data chats are being held with students regarding progress
c. teachers will develop rotational schedule to ensure all students have access to technology.
d. Teachers will engage students in small instruction based on adaptive technology result.

Person Responsible Aida DelCollado (aida.delcolladobaez@palmbeachschools.org)

5. Professinal Learning Communities

1. Teachers will meet weekly through PLCs to collaborate, share best AVID practices, and plan for differentiated lesson planning based on data (Student needs).
2. Teachers will be provided professional development on analyzing writing results.
4. Administration and coaches will monitor implementation of collaboration and AVID strategies through informal walk throughs.
5. Through PLCs teachers will analyze formative assessments and create lessons based on students needs to monitor their learning growth.

Person Responsible Leah Rock (leah.rock@palmbeachschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan and with the goal to increase the academic instruction of all students- Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards including the content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a Single School Culture of excellence in Academics, Behavior, and climate with an appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment of S.B. policy 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the
***History of Holocaust;**
***History of African Americans;**
***Study of contributions of Hispanics to the US**
*** Study of the contributions of Women to the US, and**
***Sacrifices of Veterans in serving our country.**

Within our school, teachers will teach these practices through our curriculum to reflect the application of the school's SwPBS universal guidelines of students practicing being kind, strong and smart students through our AVID strategies and character focus. As part of our SwPBS focus, SEL morning meetings, and AVID all staff personnel will clarify their expectations for positive interpersonal interaction and create structure for a single school culture of excellence.

As an early intervention to increase student readiness to enter kindergarten we offer a VPK program. This program is supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and follows all statutes, rules and contractual mandates in the Florida VPK Statewide Provider Agreement. Participating children are expected to transition to kindergarten.

To assist with the transition of school-based and community children into the kindergarten program we engage in the following kindergarten transition activities:
-Holding open house
-Opportunities for preschool children to visit a kindergarten class to see what it will be like.
-At the beginning of the school year, Kindergarten students are assessed using the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener to gather information on a child's overall development and to specifically address the readiness of each student for kindergarten based on the VPK Education Standards.
-Common assessments will be used to plan academic instruction.

Kindergarten Round-Up is offered once a year.

Every six to eight weeks every grade level will meet with the School Based Team to determine the needs of the students and place them in the appropriate settings that meet their specific learning needs. Interventionists and SAI teachers meet with the students daily to provide them 30-45 minutes in both English and Spanish.

This year identified students will be participating in tutorial. Instruction will be based on the students individual needs as determined through out SBT and PLCs.

Our WIG focus (Wildly Important Goal) we will focus on the implementation of AVID strategies to ensure rigorous instruction and the use of questioning and inquiry skills to prepare our students as they continue their academic journey at Forest Hill Elementary and throughout middle school, high school and beyond.
AVID's (Advancement Via Individual Determination) mission is to close the achievement gap by preparing all students for college readiness and success in a global society.
AVID Elementary incorporates growth mindset, student success skills, organizational skills, and partnerships within the school and community.

Science was placed back on the fine arts wheel in order to enhance the knowledge of our students with the science standards. We also increased support staff to support teachers with

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.

To build community relations we host a fall festival once a year in which our families and school can come together to celebrate fall.

In order to continue to build relationships with the community, our ELL coordinator has implemented coffee and chatter once a month with our parents in which our parents are welcomed to come and chat with our administration about.

Our school provides the opportunities, through our Pro Dad meetings in which our dads are invited to our campus to receive information to academically support their child at home and provided with strategies and tools to support their child with Student Emotional Learning. This also builds our continuing efforts in affording our parents with language and education studies.

Increase teacher communication with parents to a minimum to once a month.

Through our Parent Teacher Team Meetings three times a year, our teachers and parents can plan and implement family hands-on training through live or digital platforms that supports and provides strategies to use at home for students to increase academic achievement in the area of math, science and reading in the parents home language, as these activities can be replicated at home.

Send home parent invitations of events in home language and send reminders using the Parent Link Call Outs prior to events.

ESOL meetings will be scheduled a minimum of twice per year.

Encourage and increase the use of the Family Resource Center is a community center that provides resources for our local families to increase education on free and local services that are available to them around the community.

Annual meeting will be held to give parents an explanation of Title 1 and "Parents' Right to Know" which includes school-wide test results and notification of teacher and paraprofessional qualifications.

Once a month we host a volunteer orientation meeting for our parent/community and business partners.
Monthly, SAC will meet to evaluate school-wide assessments to design and implement changes to the SWP.
Annually, SAC will evaluate the Parent/Student/Teacher Compact, Parental Involvement Plan, SAC By-Laws, Title 1 Surveys, and make necessary recommendations to align to the SIP.

The PFEP can be found within federal programs

Once a year we hold a Multicultural Night in which we exhibit the various student's cultures and diversities through dance, music, art, and project based learning.

During the beginning of our virtual school our staff came together to celebrate our students through a teacher car parade to support our students SEL during a difficult time.

For the third year in a row we have been awarded the school of excellence, this represents our continued environmental and health efforts.

For the past 35 plus years we have received the Five Star School of Excellence which is presented to schools who have shown exemplary community involvement.

Forest Hill is also a silver Everglades Champion School because we have integrated the Everglades into our curriculum.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$901.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	120-Classroom Teachers	0621 - Forest Hill Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	819.53	$901.00
			Notes: All money will be used towards a program or process for student achievement & school improvement.			
					Total:	**$901.00**