Forest Hills Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Forest Hills Elementary School

10112 N OLA AVE, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Forest Hills Elementary will support the character development 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 through resiliency, character and life skills education while promoting their academic success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

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

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school has a School advisory team that meets monthly to provide input in school improvement. The School Improvement Plan is voted on by stakeholders.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school will monitor the effective implementation of the school improvement plan by using student test data, classroom walk throughs and observations focused on instructional priorities. The SIP plan will be adjusted accordingly based on the data collected and analyzed quarterly.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	90%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	51	48	42	39	33	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions		1	3	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	48	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	37	34	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	9	24	25	0	0	0	59

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	49	47	59	34	36	0	0	0	226
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	5	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	75	40	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	52	34	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	13	47	75	40	0	0	0	175

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	49	47	59	34	36	0	0	0	226
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	5	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	75	40	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	52	34	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	13	47	75	40	0	0	0	175

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	24	50	53	29	53	56	27		
ELA Learning Gains				51			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			52		
Math Achievement*	48	56	59	44	50	50	36		
Math Learning Gains				58			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			25		
Science Achievement*	36	50	54	37	59	59	28		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	68	59	59	27			58		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	201
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	1
ELL	27	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	1	1
HSP	41			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	32	Yes	1	
FRL	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	46			
HSP	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	24			48			36					68
SWD	12			23			20				4	
ELL	9			37			17				5	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			37			30				4	
HSP	23			51			41				5	69
MUL	70			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	17			40			42				4	
FRL	22			46			36				5	75

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	29	51	58	44	58	63	37					27
SWD	11	51	68	28	50	50	24					27
ELL	18	47	50	40	52	59	40					27
AMI												
ASN	60			80								

					2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	25	56	67	36	55	50	32					
HSP	27	49	53	47	61	67	35					28
MUL	50			40								
PAC												
WHT	31	43		42	57		38					
FRL	27	49	57	43	57	61	34					30

					2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	27	37	52	36	39	25	28					58
SWD	15	32	50	26	39	27	30					64
ELL	21	46	55	32	42		29					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	31		25	41		20					
HSP	28	41	40	38	39	33	31					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33			38								
FRL	26	37	50	35	40	26	28					62

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. <u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

			ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	26%	53%	-27%	54%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	21%	54%	-33%	58%	-37%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	20%	46%	-26%	50%	-30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	55%	-6%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	51%	-22%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is reading proficiency across all grade levels. Across all grade levels there are trends of low proficiency, particularly for ESE and ELL students in the area of language arts.

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

From the prior year reading proficiency continues to be the area of greatest need. The percent of ELA proficiency continues to remain stagnant.

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.

Reading proficiency continues to have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Some of the contributing factors were low attendance as well as lack of purposeful and standards aligned independent practice.

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

The components that showed the most improvement was math proficiency levels. In this area we really focused as a school on targeted small group instruction based on benchmarks of greatest needs, frequent data analysis and aggressive monitoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

An area of concern continues to be reading proficiency for our students with disabilities.

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

Our highest priorities are:
1. Reading Proficiency
2. Science Proficiency
3. Maintaining and increasing math proficiency

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teachers will employ high level instructional practices and structures that allow all students to master grade level benchmarks and standards. Forest Hills' high-level practices will be focused on small group instruction and aggressive monitoring. This was identified as an area of critical need because walk thru data and FAST data indicated low levels of student proficiency. In order to impact student achievement, teachers must understand the depth of the benchmarks, provide students ample opportunities to practice with purposeful aligned tasks while aggressively monitoring and analyzing the data to provide intentional small group instruction.

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

ELA Proficiency: 40%
3rd ELA Proficiency: 35%
Math Proficiency: 60%
Science Proficiency: 45%
Gains: ELA- 60% Math: 65%
Lowest BQ Gains: 60% Math: 65%

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 with high leverage instructional practices of small group and aggressive monitoring, data collection and analysis to create purposeful reteach pans. Student data from progress monitoring assessments will also be used to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Soto (michelle.soto@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidenced based strategies being implemented for this area are intentional small group instruction based on data and aggressive monitoring. Aggressive monitoring allows teachers to provide in the moment feedback and collect data on students' independent level of performance. This data may be used to inform next steps in instruction including the small group instruction.

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

If teachers focus on high level instructional practices and structures like aggressive monitoring and small groups, they will be better equipped to meet student needs thus increasing student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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: Michelle Soto (michelle.soto@hcps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Classroom visits by administration to check for small group instruction and aggressive monitoring implementation.

Person Responsible: Michelle Soto (michelle.soto@hcps.net)

By When: On-going

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

Person Responsible: Michelle Soto (michelle.soto@hcps.net)

By When: on-going

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Forest Hills strives to create classroom cultures that are intentional in developing students' character, resiliency and life skills by increasing students' connection to their school community through relationships and providing constructive responses to misbehavior. Teachers have allotted time on the schedule for daily community 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, Community Meetings, Tier 1 coaching & consulting, restorative practices, culture walkthroughs as well as a schoolwide house system that fosters a sense of belonging, positive culture & environment.

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

Behavioral incidents will decrease by 50% and average daily attendance will increase to 93% due to students feeling more connected to school and forming positive relationships.

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

This area of focus will be monitored using the KPI data specifically tracking behavioral incidents and attendance rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Soto (michelle.soto@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Forest Hills has implemented a schoolwide house system that fosters a sense of belonging, positive culture & environment.

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

The use of the house system helps students feel connected to their school, fosters a sense of belonging and a sense of ownership of their contribution to their house by following the expectations and being in attendance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide PD opportunity on the House system and implementation.

Person Responsible: Michelle Soto (michelle.soto@hcps.net)

By When: Pre-planning August and ongoing

Provide time on the schedule for community meetings.

Person Responsible: Michelle Soto (michelle.soto@hcps.net)

By When: First week of school and on going

Use of Liveschool to track points and get students excited about taking responsibility and earning House points.

Person Responsible: Michelle Soto (michelle.soto@hcps.net)

By When: August 14 and on going

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The leadership team reviews the data and determines areas of greatest needs to allocate funds appropriately. Since our area of greatest need is reading proficiency, funding was allocated to a reading coach and reading resource to meet the needs of our students in the area of ELA. In addition, we look at student behavior data to allocate funds to support students in that area as well. Our budget items are aligned with our school goals to best support our student needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 employ high level instructional practices and structures that allow all students to master grade level benchmarks and standards. Forest Hills' high-level practices will be focused on Flamingo small group instruction and aggressive monitoring. This was identified as an area of critical need because walk thru data and STAR data indicated low levels of student proficiency. In order to impact student achievement, teachers must understand the depth of the benchmarks, provide students ample opportunities to practice with foundational skills and purposeful aligned tasks while aggressively monitoring and analyzing the data to provide intentional small group instruction.

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

Teachers will employ high level instructional practices and structures that allow all students to master grade level benchmarks and standards. Forest Hills' high-level practices will be focused on small group instruction and aggressive monitoring. This was identified as an area of critical need because walk thru data and FAST data indicated low levels of student proficiency. In order to impact student achievement, teachers must understand the depth of the benchmarks, provide students ample opportunities to practice with purposeful aligned tasks while aggressively monitoring and analyzing the data to provide intentional small group instruction.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of student in grades k-2 scoring above the 40% in reading will increase to 40%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of students in grades 3-5 reading at proficiency will increase to 40%.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The area of focus will be monitored by participation in planning sessions, classroom visits to ensure the implementation of standards aligned instruction with high leverage instructional practices of small group and aggressive monitoring, data collection and analysis to create purposeful reteach pans. Student data from progress monitoring assessments will also be used to monitor progress.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Soto, Michelle, michelle.soto@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

The evidenced based strategies being implemented for this area are intentional small group instruction based on data and aggressive monitoring. Aggressive monitoring allows teachers to provide in the moment feedback and collect data on students' independent level of performance. This data may be used to inform next steps in instruction including the small group instruction. Small group instruction in k-2 will follow the Flamingo structure which will allow more opportunity for students to practice with foundational skills and progress monitoring opportunities as well.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

If teachers focus on high level instructional practices and structures like aggressive monitoring and small groups, they will be better equipped to meet student needs thus increasing student achievement.

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
1. Collaborative planning time with grade level teams and coaches will be built into the schedule for teachers to understand the depth of the benchmarks and plan lessons for both whole and small group including checks for understanding. 2. Classroom visits by administration to check for small group instruction and aggressive monitoring implementation. 3. Common assessments and scheduled time for data analysis with teachers and coaches.	Soto, Michelle, michelle.soto@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan is printed, and a hard copy is available for view in the front office for all stakeholders. In addition, there is a SAC meeting held to review the SIP plan with stakeholders and it is also made available in our website, https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/foresthills.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Forest Hills has a FACE ambassador who is responsible for organizing and supporting site-based family and community events and communicating events. In addition, parents have opportunities to attend open house, multiple conference nights and family days to connect with the school and stay informed about their child's progress. Weekly informational parent links will be sent out to help build the school home connection. In addition, there the parent engagement plan is also made available in our website, https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/foresthills.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Forest Hills intends to strengthen the academic program and increase the amount of quality learning time by provided extended learning program (ELP)opportunities beginning in October to reinforce concepts for students who require additional time and support especially in the area of reading. A Saturday academy beginning in November will also be implemented to support students with the highest academic needs. In addition, teachers will have professional development opportunities to strengthen their practices and positively impact student achievement.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

-

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Forest Hills has a student services team that meets on a weekly basis to discuss student needs and supports. Chrysalis mental health has partnered with us to provide on-site support to students who are referred by our student services team.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

-

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our school uses the multi-tiered systems of support to address behavior. Our tier 1 plan is composed of the schoolwide house system and the use of CHAMPS. The student services team serves as tier 1 consultants providing feedback and support to teachers who need it. For tier 2 and beyond, MTSS behavior meetings are held monthly with teachers to create and or revise tier 2 plans and FBA's/PBIP's.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional learning opportunities are made available through the use of walk-thru data and the areas of need focused on our instructional priorities. In addition, to retain our teachers new teacher PLC's are held monthly to provide any needed support and new teachers are paired with a veteran teacher to have as a mentor.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Forest Hills implements standards aligned instruction and assessments to preschool children in order to prepare them for kindergarten. The data is collected, and instruction is adjusted accordingly focused on student need. In addition, preschool families are able to participate in the kindergarten round up and academic family nights to prepare them for the transition.