

Marion County Public Schools

Forest High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Forest High School

5000 SE MARICAMP RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lamar Rembert

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Forest High School

5000 SE MARICAMP RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[no web address on file]

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)
High School 9-12	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

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.

"The Forest High School Community is committed to providing the skills and education necessary for students to reach their full potential."

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Forest High School educational environment encourages school-to-career skill development and post-secondary education by providing a wide variety of core and elective courses, as well as sports and activities.

Forest High School provides a safe learning environment in which students can be successful as individuals, as members of a team, and within the community.

Forest High School fosters open communication between the school and home, and encourages family involvement.

Forest High School teachers are provided staff development opportunities to master technologies and instructional strategies to improve student performance.

Forest High School promotes an equal opportunity learning environment and encourages all students to respect the cultural diversity of others.

Forest High School provides motivation and encouragement to students to help them achieve their goals.

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
Brown, Elizabeth	Principal	Principal: The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary.
		Assistant Principal: The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
		Athletic Director: The Athletic Director works with the school administrative team to assure that student-athletes are academically successful and acts as the liaison between the athletic and academic departments.
Miller, William	Administrative Support	
Tucker, Donald	Other	
Wade, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Stopyra, David	Assistant Principal	
Willis, Tara	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2018, Lamar Rembert

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

112

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636	582	550	517	2285
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	54	67	99	356
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	76	71	69	318
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	172
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	138	52	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	99	44	145

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	0	0	0	0	0	61	75	140	138	414

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	25	20	13	16	74
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 8/26/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532	532	542	515	2121
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	48	58	76	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	38	84	38	224
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	101	107	88	341
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	71	94	70	317

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	0	0	0	0	0	258	255	224	218	955

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	25	20	13	16	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532	532	542	515	2121
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	48	58	76	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	38	84	38	224
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	101	107	88	341
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	71	94	70	317

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	0	0	0	0	0	258	255	224	218	955

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	25	20	13	16	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2

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	58%	46%	56%	56%	43%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	48%	51%	54%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	39%	42%	43%	40%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	49%	40%	51%	57%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	43%	43%	48%	46%	38%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	37%	45%	33%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	61%	68%	71%	59%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	71%	73%	76%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	63%	50%	13%	55%	8%
	2018	58%	46%	12%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	51%	46%	5%	53%	-2%
	2018	55%	46%	9%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	64%	10%	67%	7%
2018	70%	61%	9%	65%	5%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	70%	2%	70%	2%
2018	77%	69%	8%	68%	9%
Compare		-5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	36%	54%	-18%	61%	-25%
2018	44%	57%	-13%	62%	-18%
Compare		-8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	51%	5%	57%	-1%
2018	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
Compare		0%			

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	25	38	38	26	29	15	52	36		88	21
ELL	18	35	32	24	20		50	56			
ASN	61	35		45			91	90			
BLK	37	41	36	24	29	14	48	52		89	27
HSP	49	49	38	43	35	12	69	76		85	48
MUL	40	50	40	58	48		76	65		93	64
WHT	67	53	47	59	49	35	82	79		96	57
FRL	46	44	34	37	35	16	67	63		89	37

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	28	45	37	18	40	29	28	49		63	26
ELL	18	48	44	24	31		67			56	40
ASN	79	64		68	56		93				
BLK	32	41	40	29	40	31	45	61		85	30
HSP	48	47	46	43	47	28	67	67		78	48
MUL	41	47	43	34	26		71	64		89	48
WHT	66	56	49	60	49	33	77	86		92	56
FRL	45	46	42	44	43	32	61	69		80	39
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	11	27	29	18	30	16	31	37		59	17
ELL	23	43	50	50	67		63			85	27
AMI				36	10						
ASN	69	60		73	44						
BLK	27	40	33	42	47	35	46	52		85	23
HSP	50	56	48	53	47	38	65	63		90	42
MUL	60	57	44	49	46	36	61	73		100	26
WHT	64	57	50	62	46	31	78	85		92	46
FRL	41	46	40	47	44	35	62	62		85	27

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	64
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	40
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	50
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
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.

Algebra I due to low skill set incoming to the course as well as the offering of the course at the middle school level for high skill set students. We do not have up to date data on growth but did show growth in Algebra pre-COVID.

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

Algebra I lowest 25% due to the lack of focus on this student group in remediation modes.

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.

Algebra one and already stated above

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

9th Grade ELA as a result of focused deliberate data proven teaching strategies coupled with specific designated remediation time each day.

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

Students with a high absentee rate consist of a large percentage of our failure rate on the Algebra I EOC.

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

1. Learning gains on the Algebra EOC
2. Positive school climate and culture
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Focus will be learning gains of our lowest 25% on the Algebra EOC. Our learning gain rate is considerably lower than the state average and district average.

Measurable Outcome: If Forest High School teachers utilize collaborative teaching strategies, formative assessment analysis, and our enrichment period to provide additional Math instruction, then we predict a 10% learning gain in our lowest 25% students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize collaborative teaching approaches that include hands on learning, collaborative learning, and formative assessment to monitor progress. Study Island will be utilized through CAT Period to provide additional instructional to the specific cohort of students as well as additional one on one instruction with the expert teacher. Extra collaborative planning time will be given to Math teachers. Data digs will be utilized often to assess progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Innovative teaching styles are research proven to work with struggling students. The implementation of Study Island in our remedial extra instruction classes was determined successful by the research from those that have utilized the program at their schools previously. Collaborative planning time for teachers is a best practice and lends itself to student success in the classroom. Using data to plan next lesson steps is a researched based strategy to enhance student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Design CAT Period to accommodate lowest 25% for extra instruction.
2. Utilize Study Island
3. Provide extra collaborative planning time for Math teachers
4. Conduct continuous data digs to progress monitor student success
5. Create tool for students to monitor their own progress.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School culture is the driving force of student success. From the actual physical appearance of the school to the programs offered within, all aspects of the school culture should focus on promoting post secondary preparedness. Gradual release of student learning to the culmination of student ownership and empowerment should be evident in all aspects of the school. An on going survey of students level of preparedness for post secondary educational options show a significant decrease in students pursuing these options to only 53% of students stating they had secured a post secondary plan.
Measurable Outcome:	Forest High School will increase the preparedness level of students for post secondary options by 27% to 80% of students securing a post secondary option by graduation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are implementing several different programs to enhance focus on post secondary options while also providing a more professional physical environment that lends itself to the promotion of collaboration, soft skills implementation, and the three Es (Employment, Enlistment, Enrollment). Programs are research based and district supported.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy drives the success of students and provides an atmosphere that is indicative of post secondary options for all students. The programs and steps of the strategy provide the students with a clear direction of what they will do after graduation while also creating an environment that will allow them to learn skills and methods that are career or college ready.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of AICE General Paper at senior level
2. Gradual sunset of senior release
3. Branding the school (study cubicles and group work areas)
4. Implementation of AVID
5. Marketing CCAP in the physical and virtual enviroment

Person Responsible Elizabeth Brown (elizabeth.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Administrative team will work collaboratively with teachers to design an all encompassing plan to ensure success for each student.

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.

Forest High School hosts a variety of events to encourage parent involvement throughout the year. These include Open House, Open Campus, Parent Meetings, Parents Night, Awards Ceremony and athletic events.

Our yearly "Open House" gives parents a chance to meet and interact with their child's teacher, as well as learn important information pertaining to that course. This event opens the door to effective communication for the year.

A monthly newsletter is posted on-line as well as paper copies are made available. This highlights important activities and meetings of the Forest High School Community. Monthly SAC (School Advisory Council) meetings are held to keep the parents abreast of successes and challenges at Forest High School.

The "Family Access" portal is available and encouraged at Forest. This allows parents to monitor their students academic performance online. A quarterly progress report is prepared by all teachers for the parents also.

We would like all parents to be involved with their students by actively using the "Family Access".

Teachers maintain individual websites to communicate course content, assignments, and important dates to their students.

Forest remains active on social media sites Facebook and Twitter.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00