Forest Hill Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Forest Hill Elementary School

5555 PURDY LN, West Palm Beach, FL 33415

https://fhes.palmbeachschools.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/18/2023.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
McNichols, Scott	Principal	Scott is the instructional leader for the school and overseeing the day to day operations. He is responsible for overseeing all systems at Forest Hill Elementary and ensuring it's effectiveness. He is responsible for the safety of everyone at Forest Hill Elementary and ensuring the equitable instruction for all students. He is the decision maker in regards to the master schedule, teacher evaluations and supervision, curriculum, professional development, professional learning community, hiring new teachers and school improvement activities. He also manages and supervises the business side of the elementary school. He is also apart of the SAC committee.
Rock, Leah	Assistant Principal	Leah is responsible for the day to day operations in Mr. McNichols absence. She is responsible for the School Wide Positive Behavior cultural within Forest Hill Elementary. She is also responsible for monitoring the curriculum and instruction of K-5 teachers.
Bisono, Edy	Reading Coach	Dual Language Coach: Edy is responsible for developing the scope and sequence in both ELA and SLA in grades 3-5 and making instructional based decisions based upon assessment data.
DelCollado, Aida	Other	She is also responsible for monitoring the ELA/SLA curriculum and instruction of K-5 teachers. Aida is responsible for the monitoring and leading the professional learning communities. Within the professional learning community she is responsible for all data review. She is also responsible to ensure all materials for instruction are made available to teachers.
Pomeroy, Jenna	Other	She is also responsible for monitoring the curriculum and instruction of K-5 teachers in Mathematics. Jenna is responsible for the monitoring and leading the professional learning communities. Within the professional learning community she is responsible for all data review. She is also responsible to ensure all materials for instruction are made available to teachers.
Edwards, Lora	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESOL Lora is responsible for keeping open communication with parents in our Dual Language program. She is responsible for all our ELL students placements and needs within the classroom. Lora coordinates our CLF and ESOL teacher schedules and overseas their instruction.
Prieto, Courtney	Instructional Coach	SBT Lead/Reading Intervention Teacher: Courtney is responsible for monitoring, leading and implementing School Based Team at Forest Hill Elementary. She is also responsible for coaching 3-5 ELA teachers. ESP contact

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Siedman, Joy	Reading Coach	ESOL Teacher: Joy is responsible for our AVID implementation as our AVID coordinator. She is responsible for ensuring that our schools culture is following AVID strategies and implementation. She also works directly with ESOL students in K-3 ELA (LY and LF).
Starr, Duane	Other	ESE Contact: Duane is responsible for overseeing the ESE department. He maintains open communication with our ESE parents and schedules our ESE meetings.
Servino de Gutierrez, Charity	Reading Coach	ELL resource teacher: Charity is responsible for developing the scope and sequence in both ELA and SLA in grades K-2 and making instructional based decisions based upon assessment data.

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 Behavior Health Professional (SBHP) supports the behavioral and mental health of students and works along with the school counselors. The SBHP position started in 2019 as part of the Marjory Stoneman Douglass High School Public Safety Act to have more mental health professionals in schools. Through Parent Trainings we support families with educational workshops facilitated by our school counselors, Behavior Health Professional, Co-located Therapist, reading and math coaches, ESOL, ESE, and Single School Culture Coordinators and the Administrative Team.
Our ESOL Coordinator and ESOL School Counselor work in conjunction with the District's multicultural department to ensure the fidelity of implementation of programs and services designed to improve the outcomes of English Language Learners.
The ESOL Coordinator and ESOL School Counselor work together to provide school and community support services for families of migrant students. These supports are supplemental to school-wide supports for students and families.
A school district officer is on campus every day for the safety and security of all students and staff. The school has one point of entry for everyone. Fortify Florida Application is on every computer, and students are made aware of this "app" in our assemblies. The "Raptor System" is used to sign parents/visitors before they can go to a classroom, or school event on campus.

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))

Student assessments include the new Progress Monitoring which occurs 3 times per year. In VPK-Grade 2 there is Early Literacy/Star Reading, and Star Math. In Grades 3-5 there is FAST Reading and Math. Performance Matters Assessments, Florida Standards Assessments, iReady, and district diagnostics. The annual test administered for ELL students is ACCESS. In addition, the WIDA is used to

assess ELL students' proficiency in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Teachers are trained by instructional coaches to
assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction based on the results of data. Single school culture (Academics, Behavior, Climate) Academics: Collaborative Planning Communities and Professional Learning Communities occur every week per grade level.
Grade level teachers meet with the academic coaches and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create standards-based learning goal scales. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed.
Monitoring will take place throughout the year. We will monitor mastery of grade level benchmarks through the use of Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostic, and FAST Progress Monitoring. The Unit Assessments will occur at the end of unit. The iReady Diagnostic and the FAST/STAR assessments will occur three times a year.
Employing frequent monitoring will allow us to make adjustments to the instructional focus for remediation, remediating deficiencies before they become substantial. In addition, we will be able to individualize instruction to best meet the needs of our students, thus increasing student achievement.
We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:
• Review of Lesson Plans
• Data Analysis
• Classroom walks
• Student attendance
• Data Chats
• Formal Observations
• Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation
• Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology

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	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: A
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	67	71	54	41	45	43	0	0	0	321
One or more suspensions	2	6	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	56	29	36	73	28	63	0	0	0	285
Course failure in Math	44	20	38	36	33	26	0	0	0	197
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	58	55	0	0	0	175
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	43	81	52	0	0	0	176
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	7	56	52	0	0	0	117

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	53	27	37	71	74	70	0	0	0	332

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	1	3	11	10	3	0	0	0	28
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	0	65	53	54	31	47	0	0	0	250
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	23	47	54	27	42	0	0	0	193
Course failure in Math	0	26	38	41	21	34	0	0	0	160
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	21	36	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	48	0	0	0	50
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	

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	27	42	58	28	55	0	0	0	210

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	65	53	54	31	47	0	0	0	250
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	23	47	54	27	42	0	0	0	193
Course failure in Math	0	26	38	41	21	34	0	0	0	160
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	21	36	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	48	0	0	0	50
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	

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	27	42	58	28	55	0	0	0	210

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	43	53	53	55	59	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				69			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66			55		
Math Achievement*	44	57	59	60	53	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				68			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			41		
Science Achievement*	70	54	54	70	59	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					47	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	56	59	62			59		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	257
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	43			
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	53			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			

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%
FRL	49			

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	58			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	58			
HSP	64			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	63			

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	43			44			70					55
SWD	36			38			61				5	42
ELL	33			36			58				5	55
AMI												
ASN	75			75							2	
BLK	44			49			67				5	60
HSP	38			41			68				5	55
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	58			38							4	55
FRL	39			39			70				5	53

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	55	69	66	60	68	63	70					62
SWD	47	71	65	51	65	55	47					59
ELL	46	68	63	55	66	63	62					62
AMI												
ASN	87			67								
BLK	54	67		55	66	45	71					47
HSP	53	67	67	60	65	65	71					63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65			59	90							
FRL	54	69	66	59	67	63	69					60

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	53	61	55	50	49	41	47					59
SWD	41	47	60	44	50		29					51
ELL	43	56	44	42	46	50	40					59
AMI												
ASN	73			70								
BLK	58	50		51	42		39					31
HSP	50	63	59	48	51	50	47					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57			64								
FRL	52	61	53	50	50	43	47					59

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. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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	33%	56%	-23%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	58%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	48%	-14%	50%	-16%

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	91%	54%	37%	54%	37%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	57%	0%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	8%	52%	-44%	61%	-53%
05	2023 - Spring	27%	56%	-29%	55%	-28%

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	51%	11%	51%	11%

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.

Math in grades 4-5 showed the lowest performance in the school. Due to the foundational math skills not being fully developed among all students, students did not fully gain an understanding of the standards that were instructed this year. The mention of foundational math skills not being fully developed among all students suggests that some students might be lacking in essential math skills needed to grasp more advanced concepts. This lack of a solid foundation can hinder their ability to understand and apply higher-level standards. The assessment was also new this year and students had not been afforded the opportunity to take a math state assessment online prior to this year. The fact that the assessment was new this year suggests that students might not have been familiar with the format and style of questions.

This can lead to anxiety and confusion among students. They might struggle with navigating the online interface, interpreting the questions, and effectively communicating their answers.

ELA- In grades 3-5, reading also exhibited significantly low performance within the school. This could be attributed to certain students lacking a well-established foundation in essential reading skills, which in turn impacted their comprehensive understanding of the instructed standards for this academic year. The insufficiency in foundational reading skills might hinder their capacity to grasp and apply more advanced concepts, leading to difficulties in meeting higher-level standards. Furthermore, this year introduced a new reading assessment, and students had not previously encountered the experience of taking a state assessment for reading online. The introduction of a novel assessment format implies that students may have been unfamiliar with the structure and types of questions presented. This lack of familiarity can potentially trigger anxiety and confusion among students. They might face challenges in navigating the online interface, comprehending the questions, and articulating their responses effectively.

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

The FY23 Progress Monitoring Data reveals a significant decline in proficiency scores for both Math and English Language Arts (ELA) compared to the prior year's Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) results. The data indicates a substantial 10% decrease in ELA proficiency and a notable 9% decrease in Math proficiency. This decline raises concerns about the factors influencing student performance and warrants a closer examination of the underlying causes. The shift to online assessments, especially if unfamiliar to students, might have hindered their performance due to difficulties in navigating the digital platform and managing time effectively.

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.

In the realm of education, the intricate interplay between students, standards, assessments, and teachers forms the foundation for learning and growth. The characters in this narrative are the students, teachers, standards, assessments, and resource teachers who collectively shape the educational landscape.
At the forefront of this tale are the students, whose proficiency levels serve as a benchmark against the state standards. The narrative pivots on the stark disparity between the students' proficiency and the state's expectations, reflecting a substantial gap that demands attention.
The unfolding drama is influenced by several contributing factors. A pivotal catalyst is the shift in standards and assessments. These revised benchmarks introduce new complexities, a labyrinth of depth, and intricate foundational components. However, for the teachers, these standards present a challenge. They find themselves in a dynamic where they must first grasp the nuances of these unfamiliar standards before guiding their students toward them.
Within this intricate tapestry, the nature of questioning language emerges as a missing link. The teachers' lack of insight into the assessment's question style adds a layer of uncertainty to the learning journey. This uncertainty lingers until later in the year, when a clearer understanding of assessment patterns crystallizes.
Zooming in, the narrative turns its gaze toward the teachers, particularly those in fourth and fifth grades. They navigate uncharted territory as they endeavor to teach using a new resource, all while fathoming the depths of the standards. This resource, which emerges as a protagonist in its own right, is later revealed to be incomplete in addressing the standards' multifaceted requirements.
The stage is then invaded by resource teachers, whose entrance is marred by the circumstances beyond control. These unforeseen challenges disrupt the original plan of action, as these resource teachers must unexpectedly take charge of classrooms. The fidelity of the initial strategy is compromised, casting an element of chaos onto the evolving educational landscape.
In this intricate narrative, the characters are entwined in a complex dance. The students' struggle to

bridge the gap between their proficiency and state standards is influenced by teachers grappling with novel benchmarks, assessments, and resources. Amidst the chaos, the resource teachers attempt to step in, only to be hindered by circumstances beyond their control. Together, these characters weave a tale of education in flux, where adaptation and perseverance become the driving forces in the pursuit of educational excellence.

Forest Hill's 4th and 5th grade math instruction exhibited significant disparities compared to district scores, with 78% of students at level one by Progress Monitoring 3. Root causes could stem from intricate curriculum changes demanding deeper comprehension and critical thinking. Inadequate instructional resources might hinder effective teaching, while misaligned assessments can disconnect learning goals. Insufficient teacher training on revised curriculum and assessment methods may also contribute. Addressing these factors comprehensively is crucial for narrowing the proficiency gap and enhancing math education outcomes.

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

The data analysis reveals substantial improvements in student proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and math, focusing on white and black student subgroups. White students exhibited remarkable progress in ELA proficiency, elevating their proficiency rate from 48% during Progress Monitoring 1 (PM1) to 54% by Progress Monitoring 3 (PM3). This subgroup also significantly reduced 45% in level 1 students, indicating a positive shift towards higher proficiency levels. Similarly, black students experienced improvement by lowering their level 1 students by 25%, reflecting their enhanced mastery of ELA concepts.
In mathematics, white students increased their proficiency from 30% at PM1 to 47% at PM3. Moreover, within the white student subgroup, they had a reduction of 53% in level 1 scores from PM1 to PM3, further highlighting their advancement.

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

Ensuring student success is at the forefront of our focus. If we address the areas of concern below, we are ensuring our students receive the support needed for growth and achievement. When looking at our Early Warning System indicators our two potential areas of concern are:
• Level 1 State Assessments ELA & Math
• Reading Deficiency

In addition, as an early intervention to increase student readiness to enter Kindergarten, we offer Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Program supplemented with enrichment hours and a PreK self-contained program for students ages 3 to 5 determined eligible for exceptional student education based on goals and services as written on the Individual Education Plan. These programs are supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and the Department of Exceptional Student Education and follow all Florida statutes, rules, and contractual mandates.

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

Our areas for improvement to ensure all students learn and show growth toward their future success will focus on:
1. ELA achievement for 3rd grade students
2. Reading Achievement with a focus on ELL and SWD
3. Mathematics Achievement with a focus on ELL and SWD
4. Science Achievement with a focus on ELL and SWD

5. monitoring student achievement daily

To ensure we meet our goals and make these improvements during FY22 we plan to improve on the following:
1. Providing our teachers with professional development through common planning to monitor student progress daily
2. Classroom coaching support to assist teachers needs with instruction
3. With the assistance of the Learning Team Facilitator, disaggregating data to determine the needs of students and grouping students within small groups accordingly in order to close gaps so students are successful with standards based instruction.
4. Monitoring of iReady usage and passing rates. Team will create incentives for students that have met usage and passing rate goals.
5. Providing a block dedicated to explicit language instruction
6. Continuing with morning meetings and start our mentorship program with resource and fine arts staff to assist students with their SEL.

We are supporting the learning of our pre-kindergarten students based on the FAST assessment data and encouraging a collaborative culture where students can work together and engage in their learning through small group rotations and supporting the students' individual needs. There are two paraprofessionals in the room to support and facilitate small groups for students.
Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:
(g) History of the Holocaust
(h) History of Africans and African Americans
(i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders
(o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media
(q) Hispanic Contributions
(r) Women's Contributions
(t) Civic & Character Education
(u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

2. Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.
3. Our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts.

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

#1. 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.

A key initiative to foster a positive school culture and climate revolves around introducing a trusted adult support system on campus. This endeavor aims to give students a reliable and supportive figure within the school community. The school plans to establish this support system through a structured approach by implementing weekly email check-ins between staff members and students. These regular communications will serve as an opportunity to build relationships, offer guidance, and ensure students' well-being.
An essential aspect of this initiative involves identifying students who may not have a trusted adult in their school life. Once identified, these students will be directed toward additional support provided by the school's Guidance Counselor and Behavioral Health Professional (BHP). These professionals will play a pivotal role in pairing students with suitable, dependable adults on campus. This personalized connection will improve students' sense of belonging, emotional well-being, and overall academic experience.
By implementing this trusted adult support system, the school demonstrates a proactive commitment to creating a positive and inclusive environment for its students. This initiative emphasizes the importance of building strong relationships between staff and students and underscores the school's dedication to addressing the individual needs of every student. Ultimately, this effort has the potential to enhance students' social and emotional growth, leading to a more supportive and welcoming school culture.

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

By the end of the FY24 school year, 100% of our students will recognize who their trusted adult is on campus.

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

This initiative will be monitored through a two-fold approach. Regular weekly email check-ins between staff and students will serve as a consistent gauge of progress, fostering open lines of communication and enabling the identification of potential challenges or needs. Simultaneously, data generated from these interactions will be meticulously recorded within the School Information System (SIS), facilitating comprehensive tracking of student engagement and well-being trends over time. Furthermore, a dedicated list of students lacking a trusted adult in their school network will be curated and maintained on a watch list. By focusing on these students, the school can proactively address their individual support requirements. This approach ensures personalized care and aligns with the broader objective of cultivating a cohesive campus culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Evidence-based interventions that support our first area of focus are based on the school district's Skills for Life and Learning.

Social and Emotional Growth: The potential to enhance students' social and emotional growth aligns with research indicating the positive outcomes of interventions that promote emotional well-being and personal development.
Personalized Pairing: Pairing students with suitable and dependable adults on campus, based on

research-supported mentorship practices, contributes to students' sense of belonging and emotional well-being.
Guidance Counselor and Behavioral Health Professional (BHP) Support: Providing additional support from professionals like the Guidance Counselor and BHP aligns with research advocating for multidisciplinary collaboration to address students' diverse needs
Trusted Adult Support System: Introducing a trusted adult support system on campus is a central intervention. Research has shown that strong student-adult relationships contribute to positive school cultures and students' well-being.

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

The SEQ survey results indicated that many students do not have at least one trusted adult on campus, further solidifying the rationale for implementing a trusted adult support system. This finding provides evidence that there is a need to address the gap in student-adult relationships within the school community. Research has consistently shown that students without meaningful connections to adults are more likely to experience negative academic and emotional outcomes.

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.

1- Collaborate with Guidance Counselor and BHP to Develop a Support Plan

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

By When: 8/29/23

1- Collaborate with Guidance Counselor and BHP to Develop a Support Plan

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

By When: 8/01/23

2- Identify and Train Staff Members Willing to Participate in Check-Ins

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

By When: 08/10/23

Develop Guidelines and Procedures for Email Check-Ins, Assign Students to Staff Members for Regular Email Check-Ins

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

By When: 8/30/23

Implement Email Check-Ins and Establish a Regular Schedule and
Monitor Progress and Gather Feedback from Students and Staff

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

By When: 8/30/23

Monitor Progress and Gather Feedback from Students and Staff

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

By When: On going

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

In the realm of English Language Arts (ELA) education at our school, an intricate web of data has illuminated a pressing need for strategic small groups to bolster student proficiency. The journey to enhance literacy outcomes has been sparked by within the 3rd grade cohort, 64% of students scored below level 3 on the ELA PM3 window. Fourth and Fifth grade also showed a focused need with 58% of 4th graders and 63% of 5th graders also falling short of level 3 on the same assessment window.

In response, a comprehensive approach to instructional practice has been formulated for 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders, encompassing double downs. This strategy involves the pairing of two educators within each classroom, denoted as Teacher A and Teacher B. This collaborative model empowers both educators to leverage their unique strengths for the benefit of the students.

Teacher A takes the helm of delivering in-depth, standards-based instruction. This approach ensures that every student is exposed to rigorous content that aligns seamlessly with established educational standards.

Concurrently, Teacher B instructs with the differentiation, meticulously tailored to individual students' needs. This differentiation is expertly shaped by data gleaned from formative and diagnostic assessments. By leveraging these assessments, Teacher B crafts a personalized educational experience for each student, addressing their unique learning styles, strengths, and areas requiring growth.

A pivotal component of this dynamic approach is the joint commitment to progress monitoring. Both Teacher A and Teacher B are steadfast in their dedication to charting students' academics. They achieve this through weekly mastery assessments.

Another robust facet of this initiative encompasses word morphology, a gateway to enhancing phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Students embark on a weekly expedition through the intricate roots, prefixes, and suffixes that compose our language.

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

We aim to increase overall proficiency by 8%. In 3rd grade, the goal is to raise proficiency by 18%, reaching 60%. Meanwhile, 4th grade aims to maintain its proficiency rate at 48%, emphasizing consistency. In 5th grade, the objective is to increase proficiency by 8%, resulting in a total of 53% proficient students. These outcomes demonstrate the institution's commitment to academic improvement, accountability, and data-driven decision-making. They provide clear benchmarks for assessing progress and ensuring students receive a high-quality education. Together, these goals reflect a comprehensive strategy to enhance educational outcomes across grade levels.

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

The administration of the school has outlined a proactive approach to monitor and improve the fidelity of small group instruction. To achieve this, they have planned a series of classroom weekly scheduled walkthroughs.

During these walkthroughs, the administration will utilize a classroom walkthrough tool. This tool is designed to provide real-time data on the implementation and fidelity of small group instruction. By using this tool, administrators can gather immediate insights into how well these instructional techniques are being carried out in practice. They will also reference a range of formative assessments to complement their monitoring efforts. These assessments include USAs (Unit Summative Assessments), iReady assessments, PMs (Progress Monitoring), mastery assessments, and vocabulary data.

By analyzing the data collected from both classroom walkthroughs and formative assessments, administrators can identify trends and patterns. These trends may reveal areas of strength or areas that require adjustment within the small group instruction framework.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott McNichols (scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org)

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.)

At FHE, we will implement the double down approach and the science of reading in English Language Arts (ELA) to address literacy proficiency concerns among 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders. In response to data indicating a significant portion of students scoring below level 3 on the ELA PM3 assessment, this intervention involves the collaboration of two educators, Teacher A and Teacher B, within each classroom. Teacher A delivers rigorous, standards-based instruction to provide a strong foundation, while Teacher B tailors differentiated instruction based on individual student needs using data from formative and diagnostic assessments. This collaborative model emphasizes progress monitoring through weekly mastery assessments and focuses on word morphology to enhance phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Through this approach, the school seeks to bolster literacy outcomes by leveraging the expertise of both educators and targeting students' specific learning needs.

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

The selection of the double-down approach and the science of reading stems from a data-driven approach to address the pressing need for improved literacy outcomes within the 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade cohorts. The comprehensive analysis of assessment data, which revealed a substantial percentage of students scoring below proficiency, underscores the urgency of intervention. By pairing Teacher A and Teacher B in a collaborative model, the strategy optimally harnesses their individual strengths, effectively meeting diverse learning needs. Teacher A's rigorous standards-based instruction ensures alignment with educational benchmarks, while Teacher B's tailored differentiation leverages formative and diagnostic assessments to create personalized learning experiences. The integration of progress monitoring and a focus on word morphology adds depth to the approach, enhancing phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension skills. This strategy is thus strategically designed to holistically address identified deficiencies, promote equitable learning, and advance student achievement in English Language Arts.

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.

Data Analysis and Assessment:
Collect and analyze ELA assessment data to identify students who are scoring below proficiency (level 3).
Utilize formative and diagnostic assessments to gain insights into individual students' strengths,

weaknesses, and learning styles.
Educator Pairing:
Pair Teacher A and Teacher B within each classroom to create a collaborative teaching team.
Assign responsibilities where Teacher A focuses on standards-based instruction, while Teacher B implements differentiated instruction.
Standards-Based Instruction (Teacher A):
Design and deliver in-depth, standards-aligned lessons that cover essential ELA content.
Create engaging instructional materials and activities to facilitate active learning.
Differentiated Instruction (Teacher B):
Develop personalized learning plans for each student based on data from assessments.
Tailor instructional approaches, materials, and resources to accommodate varying learning needs.
Weekly Progress Monitoring:
Establish a routine for weekly mastery assessments to gauge student progress.
Use assessment results to adjust instruction, identify areas needing reinforcement, and celebrate achievements.

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

By When: 05/2024

2. Tutorials:
a. Analyze student data to determine students for tutorial groups and the support necessary.
b. Choose research-based supplemental materials and resources during tutorials.
c. Analyze teacher classroom data to determine who will be tutors.
d. Provide tutors with training to understand expectations and become familiar with materials to execute tutorials.
e. Students will be selected and grouped for pullout tutorials, after-school, and Saturday success academies based on the FY23 Progress Monitoring Data/ iReady Diagnostic Data results.

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

By When: 05/2024

3. Adaptive Technology (iReady, Flocabulary, Reflex):
a. Provide teachers with professional development to ensure appropriate use of adaptive technology.
b. Teachers will develop a rotational schedule to ensure all students have access to technology.
c. Teachers will engage students in small group instruction based on adaptive technology results.

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

By When: 05/2024

4. PLC's/Professional Development:
a. Development of a PLC schedule to include all content area teachers, resource teachers, and electives.
b. The PLCs/PD sessions will focus on data analysis and effective instruction based on the needs
c. Two Instructional coaches and resource teachers will develop and implement the coaching cycle to build teachers' capacity with the gradual release model, small group instruction, and differentiated instruction.
d. Instructional coaches and resource teachers will assist with standards-based planning to build teachers' capacity with
collaboratively to plan and develop lessons focused on strategies aligned to the standards.
e. Instructional coaches will build professional learning opportunities for teachers to utilize research-based strategies.

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

By When: 05/2024

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

In Grade 2, our focus is on phonics and phonological awareness to help address reading deficiencies. We are committed to use a comprehensive literacy program designed to improve reading and writing skills, particularly focusing on phonics and phonological awareness. The program likely includes structured lessons, activities, and resources to help students understand the relationships between letters and sounds, which is crucial for reading and spelling.

We are also implementing a phonological awareness initiative specifically designed for developing phonological awareness skills. It typically involves short daily lessons that target various phonological skills like rhyming, blending, segmenting, and manipulating sounds in words. The program often uses a scripted approach with a sequence of activities to progressively build phonological awareness skills. Consistent and regular practice with phonological awareness can help students become more adept at recognizing and manipulating sounds in words, which contributes to their overall reading readiness.

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

In the realm of English Language Arts (ELA) education at our school, an intricate web of data has illuminated a pressing need for strategic interventions to bolster student proficiency. The journey to enhance literacy outcomes has been sparked by compelling statistics: within the 3rd grade cohort, 64% of students scored below level 3 on the ELA PM3 window. This pattern reverberates into the subsequent grades, with 58% of 4th graders and 63% of 5th graders also falling short of level 3 on the same assessment window.

In response, a comprehensive approach to instructional practice has been formulated for 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders, encompassing what has been coined as "double downs." This innovative strategy involves the pairing of two educators within each classroom, denoted as Teacher A and Teacher B. This collaborative model empowers both educators to leverage their unique strengths for the benefit of the students.

Teacher A takes the helm of delivering in-depth, standards-based instruction. Armed with a profound understanding of the curriculum standards. This approach ensures that every student is exposed to rigorous content that aligns seamlessly with established educational standards.

Concurrently, Teacher B spearheads a realm of differentiated instruction, meticulously tailored to individual students' needs. This differentiation is not left to chance; instead, it's expertly shaped by data gleaned from formative and diagnostic assessments. By leveraging these assessments, Teacher B

crafts a personalized educational experience for each student, addressing their unique learning styles, strengths, and areas requiring growth.

A pivotal component of this dynamic approach is the joint commitment to progress monitoring. Both Teacher A and Teacher B are steadfast in their dedication to charting students' academic voyages. They achieve this through weekly mastery assessments, intricately woven into the fabric of instruction. These assessments, firmly rooted in the standards taught by Teacher A and the tailored differentiation by Teacher B, serve as beacons of student progress, guiding educators' decisions and adjustments.

However, the journey to enhance literacy does not stop at comprehension and grammar. A robust facet of this initiative encompasses the exploration of word morphology, a gateway to enhancing phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Students embark on a weekly expedition through the intricate roots, prefixes, and suffixes that compose our language. Their understanding is put to the test through comprehensive weekly assessments that gauge their grasp of these foundational elements.

In conclusion, the roadmap to transformative literacy outcomes at our school has been charted with meticulous care. The disconcerting data has led to a cascade of strategic interventions for 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders, encapsulated within the innovative "double downs" approach. The tandem efforts of Teacher A and Teacher B, fortified by their commitment to standards-based instruction and personalized differentiation, have set the stage for students' academic resurgence. Moreover, the exploration of word morphology adds an additional layer of depth to the journey, fueling phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. This comprehensive strategy not only addresses the gaps in ELA proficiency but also underscores our collective dedication to shaping confident, capable, and literate learners.

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

Our clear and quantifiable goal for its 2nd-grade students for the conclusion of the FY24 school year. Specifically, the objective is to witness a notable 13% improvement in the proficiency levels of these students, which would result in a commendable overall proficiency rate of 57%.

This measurable outcome signifies FHES unwavering commitment to enhancing the academic performance of its 2nd-grade cohort. It underscores the belief that with targeted efforts and effective teaching strategies, students in this grade can achieve significant progress in their educational journey.

The 13% increase in proficiency is a pivotal benchmark. It not only sets high expectations for students but also demonstrates the dedication to delivering quality education. This ambitious goal aims to ensure that 2nd-grade students not only meet but exceed the academic standards set for their grade level.

This outcome serves as an essential tool for assessing and evaluating the effectiveness of the school's educational practices. It provides a concrete metric against which the progress of 2nd-grade students can be measured. This data-driven approach is crucial in identifying areas that may require additional attention and resources to support student success.

Ultimately, this measurable outcome represents more than just a statistic; it represents a commitment to

the holistic development of students. It highlights the institution's mission to provide the best possible education and create an environment where every 2nd-grade student can thrive academically. By setting and striving for this goal, the institution aims to empower its 2nd-grade students with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed not only in their current academic year but also as they progress through their educational journey.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The educational institution has set a series of measurable outcomes for different grade levels, all aimed at enhancing overall proficiency and academic performance by the end of the FY24 school year.

Firstly, the institution has a broad goal to increase its overall proficiency by 8%. This overarching objective reflects the institution's commitment to advancing academic excellence across all grades and subjects.

Specifically, in 3rd grade, there's an ambitious target to boost proficiency by a substantial 18%. If achieved, this would elevate the proficiency rate to an impressive 60%. This reflects a dedicated effort to not only meet but exceed academic standards in 3rd grade.

Meanwhile, for 4th grade, the focus is on maintaining the current proficiency rate of 48%. While this may not involve an increase, it signifies the institution's commitment to sustaining a high level of proficiency in this grade level.

In 5th grade, the goal is to increase proficiency by 8%, reaching a total of 53% proficient students. This demonstrates a proactive approach to continuously improving academic outcomes in the upper elementary grades.

These measurable outcomes collectively underscore the institution's dedication to data-driven decision-making and accountability. They provide clear benchmarks against which the institution can evaluate its progress and the effectiveness of its teaching strategies. By setting these goals, the institution is not only fostering a culture of excellence but also ensuring that students receive the best possible education.

In conclusion, these measurable outcomes represent a comprehensive approach to improving educational outcomes at various grade levels. They encapsulate the institution's commitment to academic growth and excellence, serving as a roadmap to guide its efforts in the pursuit of superior educational outcomes for all students.

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 administration of the school has outlined a proactive approach to monitor and improve the fidelity of small group instruction. To achieve this, they have planned a series of classroom walkthroughs scheduled throughout the week. These walkthroughs serve as a crucial component of their strategy to ensure the effectiveness of small group teaching methods.

During these walkthroughs, the administration will utilize a classroom walkthrough tool. This tool is designed to provide real-time data on the implementation and fidelity of small group instruction. By using this tool, administrators can gather immediate insights into how well these instructional techniques are being carried out in practice. This live data collection offers a dynamic and responsive approach to assessing teaching methods.

Moreover, administrators will not solely rely on the walkthrough tool. They will also reference a range of formative assessments to complement their monitoring efforts. These assessments include USAs (Unit Summative Assessments), iReady assessments, PMs (Progress Monitoring), mastery assessments, and vocabulary data. This multifaceted approach ensures a comprehensive evaluation of student progress and the effectiveness of the "double down" instruction strategy.

By analyzing the data collected from both classroom walkthroughs and formative assessments, administrators can identify trends and patterns. These trends may reveal areas of strength or areas that require adjustment within the small group instruction framework. Importantly, this data-driven decision-making process allows administrators to tailor their support and interventions to the specific needs of students and teachers.

In essence, the administration's plan is a proactive and data-centered approach to improving small group instruction. It emphasizes ongoing monitoring and adjustment, ensuring that teaching strategies are not only faithfully implemented but also yielding positive outcomes for student learning. This commitment to continuous improvement reflects the school's dedication to providing the best possible education and supporting the professional development of its educators.

In conclusion, the administration's strategy combines classroom walkthroughs, a dedicated tool, and a variety of formative assessments to holistically evaluate the fidelity and effectiveness of small group instruction. This multifaceted approach enables them to make informed decisions, adapt instruction as needed, and ultimately enhance the quality of education provided to students.

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

McNichols, Scott, scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org

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?

At Forest Hill Elementary, we use Benchmark, Advance, and Benchmark Adelante as our main ELA program. Other programs like UFLI, Heggerty, and Morphology Orton Gillingham are used as supplemental instruction to provide differentiated instruction to our students in K-5. The resources provide students with strong foundational skills in English Language Arts (ELA).
These programs are aligned with the science of reading, which emphasizes the importance of systematically teaching phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills to build a solid foundation for literacy. By focusing on these key areas, these programs adhere to evidence-based practices that have shown statistically significant effects in improving student outcomes. These

programs directly align with the district's Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan, contributing to a comprehensive and cohesive approach to literacy instruction across all grades.Furthermore, these evidence-based programs are fully in line with Florida's B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. These evidence-based programs integrate well with the district's reading plan by incorporating systematic and explicit phonics instruction throughout their curriculum. They adhere to the science of reading principles, which emphasize the importance of teaching phonics in a structured and incremental manner.

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?

These programs are all research-based instructional approaches or programs designed to support literacy development. They have been developed based on educational research and best practices in the field of literacy instruction, and they aim to provide effective strategies and approaches to enhance students' language and literacy skills.
Benchmark Advance is a research-based literacy program designed to provide standards-based instruction in English Language Arts. It aligns with the science of reading principles and incorporates evidence-based practices to support students' reading, writing, and language skills development.
Adelante is also a research-based literacy program that provides bilingual instruction for English learners. It integrates evidence-based practices to support language development, literacy skills, and academic success for students developing proficiency in English and their native language.
Orton Gillingham: Orton Gillingham is a well-established and research-based approach for teaching reading, spelling, and writing to individuals with dyslexia or other language difficulties. It is grounded in decades of research and clinical experience and focuses on explicit, systematic, and multisensory instruction to help students with language-based learning differences. UFLI is a literacy program specifically designed to address the needs of English learners. It combines research-based strategies to enhance language development vocabulary acquisitiHeggerty is a phonemic awareness program designed to help students develop crucial pre-reading skills. Phonemic awareness, the ability to hear and manipulate individual sounds in spoken words, is a foundational skill for reading. The program is structured and systematic, incorporating evidence-based practices for phonemic awareness instruction. The program's approach aligns with research findings highlighting the importance of explicit and structured phonemic awareness instruction in early literacy development.
i-Ready provides instruction and assessment in reading. It offers personalized learning experiences based on individual student performance. i-Ready's content is developed using research-based best practices and instructional approaches.

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. Incorporate Small group instruction: a. Students will be assessed using USA's in Language Arts. Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction strategies and small-group instruction in all ELA courses. b. Teachers will analyze student data to determine strengths and weaknesses in the content area. c. Teachers will create all small group rotational cycles to ensure all students are supported at their abilities (AggMo). d. Teachers will create small group lesson plans utilizing instructional materials and Teaching methodologies to support all learners. e. Teachers monitor ongoing formative assessments to track student learning and make adjustments to instruction. These programs are all research-based instructional approaches or programs that are designed to support literacy development. They have been developed based on educational research and best practices in the field of literacy instruction, and they aim to provide effective strategies and approaches to enhance students' language and literacy skills.	McNichols, Scott, scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org
2. Tutorials: a. Analyze student data to determine students for tutorial groups and the support necessary. b. Choose research-based supplemental materials and resources during tutorials. c. Analyze teacher classroom data to determine who will be tutors. d. Provide tutors with training to understand expectations and become familiar with materials to execute tutorials. e. Students will be selected and grouped for pullout tutorials, after school, and Saturday success academies based on the results from USAs and Progress Monitoring and RAISE data	McNichols, Scott, scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org
Step 3 3. Adaptive Technology (iReady): a. Provide teachers with professional development to ensure appropriate use of adaptive technology. b. Teachers will develop a rotational schedule to ensure all students have access to technology. c. Teachers will engage students in small group instruction based on adaptive technology results.	McNichols, Scott, scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org
Step 4 4. PLC's/Professional Development: a. Development of a PLC schedule to include all content area teachers, resource teachers, and electives. b. The PLCs/PD sessions will focus on data analysis and effective instruction based on the needs	McNichols, Scott, scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org
4. Literacy Leadership a. Development of a twelve-week literacy plan to monitor the	McNichols, Scott, scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
implementation of the Science of reading and double down approach. b. The leadership team will meet weekly to discuss the implementation of the plan, data results, and adjustment c. The team will make decisions about professional development opportunities for teachers as well as coaching options for our new and veteran teachers to build teachers' capacity with the gradual release model, small group instruction, and differentiated instruction.	
Literacy Coaching 1- Instructional coaches will develop and implement the coaching cycle for our new and veteran teachers who need support 2-Instructional coaches and resource teachers will assist with standards-based planning to build teachers capacity with	McNichols, Scott, scott.mcnichols@palmbeachschools.org

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.

All Title I schools in SDPBC are required to complete a Schoolwide Plan (SWP) where the answers to these questions are addressed. This information is located on the District Title 1 website.

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA