

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Forest Hills Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Forest Hills Elementary School

10112 N OLA AVE, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Soto

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: D (32%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Forest Hills Elementary School

10112 N OLA AVE, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	90%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Forest Hills Elementary will support the social and emotional needs of all students while facilitating an education to develop each child to their fullest's potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Forest Hills Elementary empowers students academically, socially, and emotionally.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gordon, Regina	Principal	Instructional leader is responsible for student safety and supervision, teacher growth and development in regard to instructional practices, as well as increased student achievement.
Soto, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Soto is responsible for student safety and supervision, teacher growth and development in regard to instructional practices, as well as increased student achievement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/23/2021, Michelle Soto

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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

688

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	94	101	99	123	85	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	1	37	35	50	18	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	28	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	22	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	1	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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 6/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	86	88	103	113	115	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	14	11	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	3	2	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

2020-21 - 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	86	88	103	113	115	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	14	11	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	3	2	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				34%	52%	57%	30%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	55%	58%	40%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	50%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				37%	54%	63%	25%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	57%	62%	37%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	46%	51%	43%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				33%	50%	53%	23%	51%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	24%	52%	-28%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2021					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	56%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	62%	-33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	37%	57%	-20%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	29%	51%	-22%	53%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

I-ready reading and math - Grades 1-5

SSA Science- Grade 5

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	16	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	16	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	7
	English Language Learners	0	0	8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	10	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	10	37
	Students With Disabilities	25	8	16
	English Language Learners	9	0	24

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10	20	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	20	30
	Students With Disabilities	5	4	8
	English Language Learners	3	13	26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	15	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	15	37
	Students With Disabilities	5	0	18
	English Language Learners	3	9	27
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	24	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	24	48
	Students With Disabilities	6	12	18
	English Language Learners	0	25	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	16	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	16	43
	Students With Disabilities	3	6	24
	English Language Learners	5	0	40

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	23	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	23	31
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	4	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	10	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	10	32
	Students With Disabilities	3	0	13
	English Language Learners	4	0	16
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	15	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	15	23
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	17	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	17	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	14	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	16	38	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	38	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	7
	English Language Learners	0	71	20

Subgroup Data Review

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	15	32	50	26	39	27	30				
ELL	21	46	55	32	42		29				
BLK	18	31		25	41		20				
HSP	28	41	40	38	39	33	31				
WHT	33			38							
FRL	26	37	50	35	40	26	28				
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	14	47	50	15	41	57	24				
ELL	36	55	50	31	66	67	21				
BLK	26	55	70	31	50	68	20				
HSP	35	57	56	32	56	62	30				
WHT	37	55	50	48	56		41				
FRL	33	55	62	36	56	65	31				
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	13	38	52	12	31	27	18				
ELL	16	25	33	14	29	30	7				
BLK	27	37	39	20	35	48	15				
HSP	28	38	44	24	38	41	27				
MUL	27	30		7							
WHT	39	54		41	46		35				
FRL	29	39	42	24	36	42	23				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	302
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	36
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

Across all grade levels there are trends of low proficiency, particularly for ESE and ELL students in the areas of language arts, math and science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA proficiency with 27%. This is a decline from the 2019 school year. In addition, the math bottom quartile gains were only 25%.

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

Some of the contributing factors were attendance, lack of purposeful independent practice and too much instructional time taken for remediation. Some of the actions that will be taken this year are purposeful independent practice with student accountability as well as acceleration of content based on grade level standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on 2019 assessments there were no areas with improvements.

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

N/A

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented include aggressive monitoring with targeted feedback, scaffolding and just in time teaching of pre-requisite skills to accelerate learning.

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.

Professional learning opportunities that will be provided include a book study of "Learning in the Fast Lane", job-embedded opportunities such as learning walks, Ed camps, coaching with feedback and classroom visits.

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 sustainability include intensive bottom quartile support across content areas in the different grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Description: Teachers will leverage data to provide accountable independent practice, scaffolding and targeted feedback through grade level content.</p> <p>Rationale: Based on our FSA data, ELA, Mathematics and Science students are demonstrating significant learning gaps in grade level standards. In order to strategically accelerate student learning within grade level standards teachers will need to utilize formative assessment data and student work regularly to inform instructional decisions. Additionally, walk-through trends indicate that students did not regularly experience purposeful independent practice aligned to the standards with accountability. Teachers also lacked clarity of the alignment between the success criteria and the learning target/task which impeded their ability to appropriately scaffold and provide feedback that progressed students learning of the standards.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>ELA Proficiency: 40%</p> <p>Math Proficiency: 50%</p> <p>Science Proficiency: 35%</p> <p>ELA Overall gains: 55%</p> <p>Math Overall gains: 60%</p> <p>ELA BQ Gains: 70%</p> <p>Math BQ Gains: 70%</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Through classroom visits, we will monitor trends based on our instructional priority look fors rooted in the four principles of excellent instruction. Teachers will demonstrate effective implementation of the instructional priority look-fors with 75% accuracy or higher during every classroom visit cycle.</p> <p>District formative assessments will be utilized to hold data sessions with teachers allowing them to analyze data, determine appropriate scaffolding, provide targeted feedback and assign accountable independent practice.</p> <p>Leadership team will analyze data to monitor student achievement as well as successful implementation of instructional practices.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Common Planning will be facilitated twice weekly to ensure standards aligned, rigorous opportunities are being provided for students. Job-embedded professional development will be provided based on trends collected to support our instructional priorities. Data analysis sessions and protocol will be utilized following common assessments to ensure that action planning is standards focused, targeted, and promotes student progress.</p> <p>Aggressive monitoring will occur weekly to monitor the progress of students and provide just in time feedback that effectively supports independent practice. Teachers will use purposeful scaffolding strategies based on student needs and the demands of the standards.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Based on student and teacher data it has been determined that planning for standards aligned tasks, utilizing appropriate scaffolding strategies, and providing targeted feedback are areas of need impeding students progress towards the grade level standards. Therefore, engaging in common planning protocols, data analysis sessions and professional development aligned to priorities and walkthrough trends will provide teachers support in order to improve practice. Instructional strategies utilized will be aligned to the demands of the standards and tasks will engage students in purposeful practice aligned to the intended outcomes, which will in-turn improve students learning of the standards.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

The reading coach will facilitate planning sessions that support the development of high quality lesson plans, deepen teachers understanding of content and best practices, and support a focus on small group instruction. The reading coach will support VE teachers (SWD subgroup) weekly in data analysis and planning sessions. Planning sessions will occur twice per week, per grade level. One planning session will take place for an hour in the morning once per week and one session will take place in the afternoon once per week. The reading coach will be assigned to teachers on a rotating basis to provide coaching cycles to improve upon best practices in instruction. Coaching cycles will occur with 3 teachers at a time on a 3 week rotation. The coach will observe the teacher, provide feedback, model, observe the teacher again and provide final feedback before moving on to the next coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

The math resource teacher will facilitate planning sessions that support the development of high quality lesson plans, deepen teachers understanding of content and best practices, and support a focus on small group instruction. The math resource teacher will support VE teachers weekly in data analysis and planning sessions. Planning sessions will occur twice per week, per grade level. One planning session will take place for an hour in the morning once per week and one session will take place in the afternoon once per week. The math resource teacher will be assigned to teachers on a rotating basis to provide coaching cycles to improve upon best practices in instruction. Coaching cycles will occur with 3 teachers at a time on a 3 week rotation. The resource teacher will observe the teacher, provide feedback, model, observe the teacher again and provide final feedback before moving on to the next coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

The reading resource teacher will participate in data analysis and high quality lesson planning to support the needs of students whose data reflects that they are more than 2 years below grade level in the area of reading. This resource teacher will support students directly. Students in grades 2 & 3 will be grouped by data and the resource teacher will pull groups daily for a minimum of 30 minutes per day. iReady data, EL benchmark data, and common assessment data will be used to assess student progress and groups will be adjusted accordingly.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

The science resource teacher will facilitate planning sessions that support the development of high quality lesson plans, deepen teachers understanding of content and best practices, and support a focus on small group instruction. Planning sessions will occur for one hour once per week. The science resource teacher will support students directly. Students will be grouped using pre-test data and the science resource teacher will work with students during a lunch bunch group 3 times per week. The science resource teacher will co-teach in 5th grade science classes weekly. The science resource teacher will support grade 3 & 4 in science planning twice per month.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

Teacher leaders will implement high quality instruction for half of each school day. During the other half of the school day, teacher leaders will; facilitate planning sessions with teachers, support bottom quartile groups, coach teachers, provide feedback to teachers based on our school's instructional priority. Teacher leaders will also facilitate PD to align with the needs of teachers based on classroom visit trends.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During ELA planning, anticipate points in the lesson when scaffolding may be needed due to productive struggle. Name the scaffolding strategies that will be utilized attached to the purpose for those strategies to progress students toward success criteria. Focus on student tasks to ensure teacher clarity. Based on classroom walkthrough data, there is a lack of effective scaffolding strategies to support students in meeting learning targets.

Measurable Outcome: FSA 2022 ELA Proficiency: 40%
FSA 2022 ELA Overall gains: 55%
FSA ELA ELA BQ gains: 70%

Monitoring: The focus of bi-weekly classroom visits will be collecting evidence of implementation of effective scaffolding strategies. The desired outcome will be measured using student data from ELA i-ready, ELA district PMA's and ELA mid year assessment. If students are being provided strategic and intentional scaffolds their achievement should increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common Planning will be facilitated twice weekly to ensure standards aligned, rigorous opportunities are being provided for students. Job-embedded professional development will be provided based on trends collected to support our instructional priorities. Data analysis sessions and protocol will be utilized following common assessments to ensure that action planning is standards focused, targeted, and promotes student progress. Aggressive monitoring will occur weekly to monitor the progress of students and provide just in time feedback that effectively supports independent practice. Teachers will use purposeful scaffolding strategies based on student needs and the demands of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on student and teacher data it has been determined that planning for standards aligned tasks, utilizing appropriate scaffolding strategies, and providing targeted feedback are areas of need impeding students progress towards the grade level standards. Therefore, engaging in common planning protocols, data analysis sessions and professional development aligned to priorities and walkthrough trends will provide teachers support in order to improve practice. Instructional strategies utilized will be aligned to the demands of the standards and tasks will engage students in purposeful practice aligned to the intended outcomes, which will in-turn improve students learning of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

The reading coach will facilitate planning sessions that support the development of high quality lesson plans, deepen teachers understanding of ELA content and best practices, and support a focus on small group instruction.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

The reading coach will support VE teachers (SWD subgroup) weekly in data analysis and planning sessions. Planning sessions will occur twice per week, per grade level. One planning session will take place for an hour in the morning once per week and one session will take place in the afternoon once per week.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

Professional development will be provided to teachers around specific scaffolding strategies.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

The reading coach will be assigned to teachers on a rotating basis to provide coaching cycles to improve upon best practices in instruction. Coaching cycles will occur with 3 teachers at a time on a 3 week rotation. The coach will observe the teacher, provide feedback, model, observe the teacher again and provide final feedback before moving on to the next coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Forest Hills discipline data has improved throughout the years, in particular the out of school suspensions which has significantly decreased. However, a primary area of concern, where incidents were above the state level per 100 students from 2016 to 2019 was that of fighting and/or physical attacks. This area will be monitored with the systems and structures that have been put in place to support our school culture and environment, including behavior trackers, the system for recording behavior codes, RTI B meetings, morning meetings and restorative conferences that will foster a positive and inclusive learning environment. As a restorative school, Forest Hills recognizes that people and their relationships with each other form the cornerstone of both safety and learning. Restorative Practices are based on principles that emphasize the importance of positive relationships as central to building community and involves the process of restoring relationships when harm has occurred. Restorative Practices will be used as an alternative to traditional disciplinary measures, as well as to enhance the school community by emphasizing student voice and well-being. Teachers will be encouraged to use Restorative Practices in their classrooms daily,

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.

Forest Hills strives to create classroom cultures that are intentional in developing students' emotional intelligence, increasing students' connection to their school community through relationships, and provide constructive responses to misbehavior. Teachers have allotted time on the schedule for daily morning meetings that help build positive classroom culture and relationships. In addition, Forest Hills has implemented many systems and structures including, PBIS, CHAMPS, Attendance Incentives, 7 Mindsets, Morning Meetings, EL Education, SEL Resources, Tier 1 Coaching & Consulting, Trauma-Sensitive Framework, Restorative Practices, culture walkthroughs and small group counseling that foster a positive school culture and environment.

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

Teachers, staff, students, family members and the community are key in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Staff members who are Tier 1 consultants support grade level teams with any tier 1 behavior challenges they may encounter throughout the year. They are available to consult, provide ideas, strategies, non-evaluative observations per request, provide feedback and celebrations. Teachers use morning meeting to build relationships with students and foster a positive relationships. Forest Hills also works with families to remove any barriers and ensure partnerships for their students' success. Community members play a role in helping to provide incentives and supporting our students and teachers in promoting a positive school culture. In addition, our use of Restorative Practices will build a positive culture through emphasizing the importance of relationships between students, staff, families, and the community,

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00