

The School District of Lee County

Harlem Heights Community Charter School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

Harlem Heights Community Charter School

15570 HAGIE DR, Fort Myers, FL 33908

<http://heightscharterschool.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Debra Mathinos

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

Harlem Heights Community Charter School

15570 HAGIE DR, Fort Myers, FL 33908

<http://heightscharterschool.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Harlem Heights Community Charter School is to serve children in their elementary years of schooling who are at risk for academic challenges as a result of severe economic disadvantage and/or living in a home where English is not the primary language.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to create a small school community with focused and developmentally appropriate direct instruction in which all students are valued, accepted for who they are, supported in the development of core academic skills and encouraged to challenge their learning toward excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mathinos, Deb	Other	Director of Charter School; Chief Academic and Administrative Officer

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Debra Mathinos

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

12

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	33	17	27	32	23	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/20/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	17	22	30	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	17	22	30	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	57%	57%	0%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	58%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	50%	53%	0%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	62%	63%	0%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	65%	62%	0%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	51%	0%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	53%	0%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	39%	58%	-19%	58%	-19%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	39%	61%	-22%	62%	-23%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL											
HSP	44			47							
FRL	38			44							

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	169
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	84
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Based on FSA data from 2018-19, ELL students and students with IEPs performed the lowest. As there was no FSA testing in 2019-20 it is not possible to identify a potential trend. However, comparison of student prior performance on FSA with their prior performance on local assessment (STAR Enterprise) shows that these 2 subgroups have the greatest challenges in testing at desired level of Proficiency.

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

Without 2019-20 FSA testing it is not possible to identify a potential decline. However, comparison of student performance on on local assessment (STAR Enterprise) from March, 2020 and Septembers, 2020 shows modest decline in both math and language arts skills as a result of school closure.

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.

Based on 2018-19 FSA results, performance in Math showed the greatest gap. As there was no FSA testing in 2019-20 it is not possible to identify a potential trend. Student ability to read and understand the math required in test questions negatively impacted student performance.

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

Based on local assessment data comparing September 2019 skill levels and March, 2020 skill levels the greatest improvement across all grade levels and student groups was being made in reading. Additional small group, differentiated instruction and additional reading support was provided to all students as needed.

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

Development of English Language Proficiency in ELL students continues to be an ongoing concern

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

1. Increase English Language Proficiency in ELL students.
2. Increase reading fluency and comprehension in all students.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: BOY 2020-2021 STAR Literacy Assessment data identified 42% of Kindergarten students, 67% of First grade students, 37% of Second grade students, 47% of Third grade students, 43% of Fourth grade students and 33% of Fifth Grade students are on target for achieving grade level literacy benchmarks and expected FSA proficiency levels by EOY 2020-2021. 96% of those students not currently on track for grade level proficiency are English Language Learners.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students performing at grade level benchmark, as measured by EOY STAR Literacy assessment will increase as follows: Kindergarten 70%, First grade 95%, Second grade 75%, Third grade 80%, Fourth grade 80% and Fifth grade 75%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Additional instruction and support during ELA class time and during afternoon ACCESS time to provide small group intensive English Language/Literacy experiences to students not performing at grade level. ESOL teacher, 3 general instructional paraprofessionals and 1.5 Title I paraprofessionals will be scheduled to provide small group instruction in both push in and pull out models.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Intensive and more frequent opportunities to learn, practice and master English and reading skills will provide students a strengthened foundation to master ELA standards at expected levels of proficiency. Improved ELA skills will also allow students to master standards in related areas (math word problems, science, social studies) at expected proficiency levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Beginning of year assessment through STAR enterprise
2. Identification of students in need of additional support
3. Scheduling and delivery of additional instructional opportunities and intensive language/literacy instruction.

Person Responsible Deb Mathinos (debramat@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School-wide focus is on English Language Proficiency among ELL students as well as improving reading fluency and comprehension among all students. The increased amount and frequency of language and literacy intervention described previously addresses this area of concern.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Cooperative efforts of parents, families, educators, community members and businesses for the common good of the students provide challenging and rewarding experiences to all constituents. One of the School's greatest resources is its connection to The Heights Center (Community Center in which the school is located). The School is able to leverage the services offered to the community by The Heights Center and incorporate these services and relationships into the School. These resources include, but are not limited to, mentoring, tutoring, counseling, health care, access to food, staff development and entertainment that can be used as student incentives and rewards.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$115,358.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	4304 - Harlem Heights Community Charter School	Title, I Part A	1.5	\$53,641.00
			<i>Notes: 1.5 Title I paraprofessionals</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	4304 - Harlem Heights Community Charter School	General Fund	1.0	\$33,000.00
			<i>Notes: 1 FTE ELL Teacher</i>			
	5100	150-Aides	4304 - Harlem Heights Community Charter School	General Fund	2.0	\$28,717.00
			<i>Notes: 2 FTE instructional Paraprofessionals</i>			
Total:						\$115,358.00