
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/2/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	C	C

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 potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gordon, Regina	Principal	Mrs. Gordon 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

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Michelle Soto

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

716

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

10

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	110	103	98	125	97	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	637
Attendance below 90 percent	1	49	47	59	34	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	75	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	52	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	13	47	75	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	15	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/26/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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	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	

Students with two or more indicators 0 0 1 9 8 1 0 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	

Retained Students: Current Year 2 0 0 15 0 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 0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	29%	53%	56%				34%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						56%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						60%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	44%	50%	50%				37%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						56%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						62%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	59%	59%				33%	50%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	24%	52%	-28%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	56%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	62%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	57%	-20%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	29%	51%	-22%	53%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	11	51	68	28	50	50	24				
ELL	18	47	50	40	52	59	40				
ASN	60			80							
BLK	25	56	67	36	55	50	32				
HSP	27	49	53	47	61	67	35				
MUL	50			40							
WHT	31	43		42	57		38				
FRL	27	49	57	43	57	61	34				

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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	70
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	46
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	46
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	45
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	42
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

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

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

The greatest need for improvement is demonstrated in reading proficiency across all grade levels, and specifically the ESE subgroup with only 11% demonstrating proficiency.

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 low attendance as well as lack of purposeful and standards aligned independent practice.

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

The components that showed the most improvement were math and science proficiency as well as math learning gains, particularly the lowest quartile.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement were targeted small group instruction based on standards of need as well as frequent data analysis.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will need to continue to analyze data and provide adequate instructional groupings and support based on the standards of need.

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.

Teachers will have professional learning opportunities to build content knowledge, collaborate in planning and providing standards aligned tasks as well as data diving to analyze student data.

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

Teachers will continue to have common planning with content area coaches as well as opportunities to internalize content and analyze data to determine next steps.

Areas of Focus

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

:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Teachers will implement high quality, standards aligned instruction which will increase student achievement. This was identified as an area of critical need because walk thru data and FSA data indicated low levels of student proficiency. In order to impact student achievement, teachers must understand the depth of the standard and provide standards aligned instruction and independent tasks that are aligned to the standards for student to have ample opportunities to practice. This will be achieved through an ongoing cycle of planning, implementation, data collection and reteach opportunities.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA Proficiency: 40%
 Math Proficiency: 50%
 Science Proficiency: 45%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The area of focus will be monitored by participation in planning sessions, classroom visits to ensure the implementation of standards aligned instruction, data collection and analysis as well as overseeing the plan for reteach. Student data from progress monitoring assessments and quarterly assessments will also be used to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Regina Gordon (regina.gordon@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is high quality instruction based on the standards by planning collaboratively, implementing the plans, assessing and analyzing the data and reteaching based on standards of need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If teachers can focus on high quality instruction which includes opportunities for student discourse, purposeful practice, collaboration and active thinking with standards aligned lessons and tasks student achievement will increase.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Collaborative planning time with grade level teams and coaches will be built into the schedule.

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

Classroom visits by administration to check for planning implementation (standards aligned instruction and tasks).

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

Common assessments and scheduled time for data analysis with teachers and coaches.

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

Build in time for coaches and teachers to build standards aligned reteach lessons based on the student data.

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

RAISE

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Teachers will implement high quality standards aligned ELA instruction. This practice will be supported by an on-going cycle of collaborative team planning with reading coaches, classroom visits to ensure plans to practice, assessments and data analysis followed by reteach opportunities based on standards of need.

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

Teachers will implement high quality standards aligned ELA instruction. This practice will be supported by an on-going cycle of collaborative team planning with reading coaches, classroom visits to ensure plans to practice, assessments and data analysis followed by reteach opportunities based on standards of need.

Measurable Outcomes:

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

STAR Assessment ELA Proficiency: 40%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

FAST ELA Proficiency: 40%

Monitoring:

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

The focus of classroom visits will be collecting evidence of implementation of plans by using high leverage instructional strategies like modeling, opportunities for discourse and purposeful standards aligned tasks for students to practice. The desired outcomes will be measured using student data from progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gordon, Regina, regina.gordon@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

Based on student and teacher data it has been determined that planning for standards aligned tasks, utilizing high leverage instructional 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:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
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.	Gordon, Regina, 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.	Gordon, Regina, 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. 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. Coach may also implement side by side coaching to model high leverage instructional strategies.	Gordon, Regina, regina.gordon@hcps.net

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Forest 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 CHAMPS, Attendance Incentives, 7 Mindsets, Morning Meetings, EL Education, SEL Resources, Tier 1 Coaching & Consulting, Trauma-Sensitive Framework, Restorative Practices, culture walkthroughs, small group counseling and a House Behavior System that foster a sense of belonging, positive school culture and environment.

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

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,